

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

February, 1923

Vol. XII No. 6

Editorial Comment.....	419
The Y. M. C. A. and the Church—Is the Church Obscurantist?—Decency in Literature—Shall We Recognize Soviet Russia?—Attacks on Religion in Colleges—Further Light on the Functions of Co-Consecrators—Dr. Holmes and Judaism	
Father Welldon Goes Too Far.....	429
<i>J. G. H. Barry, D.D.</i>	
Charles Chapman Grafton.....	440
<i>A. Parker Curtiss</i>	
The Methodists.....	448
<i>Hamilton Schuyler</i>	
The Steadfastness of Washington.....	457
<i>John H. Yates</i>	
The House of Quiet.....	466
<i>A Guest</i>	
Thoughts on Medieval Thought.....	471
<i>Howard R. Patch</i>	
The Church Mission of Help and the Modern Girl.....	475
<i>Mary Willcox Glenn</i>	
Book Reviews.....	485
Books Received.....	495

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under act of March 3, 1879.

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., New York, N. Y.

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

BELIEF IN CHRIST

330 pp. Cloth \$2.25

THIS volume is a sequel to "Belief in God." It takes for granted the conclusion of the first volume as to the reality of the Divine self-revelation of which the Bible gives the record.

After a preliminary survey of different views of the person and message of Christ currently held in the intellectual world, a very close examination is made of the actual road along which the first disciples of Jesus, starting from their Jewish faith, were led to the conclusions which we see expressed by St. Paul, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the fourth Gospel. The permanent validity of this process and conclusion is carefully tested, and the question examined whether it has any tenable rivals or involves any insuperable difficulty. Then the question (1) of the Catholic creeds and dogmas concerning the person of Christ, (2) of the implications of the scriptural and Catholic belief, *e. g.*, as regards the Trinity in God, the Atonement, Human Sin, etc., are examined. And the attempt is made to conduct the argument always so as to be intelligible to the "plain man."

FOR 1923

THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN

For children in their teens, and for the family

The Rev. Charles W. Leffingwell, D.D., known and loved throughout the American Church for his work at St. Mary's School, Knoxville, Ill., and the present rector emeritus, sometime editor of *THE LIVING CHURCH*, has written a very interesting series of articles for *THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN*, entitled "Signs and Seasons." Apart from their interest to, and value for, all Churchmen, every student and graduate of St. Mary's will desire to read the articles.

Another treat is a serial about our mountain missions, by Miss Frances Kirkland, entitled "All Sides of Ararat." Miss Kirkland is not only a frequent contributor to *THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN* but also writes for other leading periodicals for children, including *The Youth's Companion*.

The Missionary Magazine

is the first issue of *THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN* for every month.

ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR

Special Rates in Quantities

Also for Little Children

THE SHEPHERD'S ARMS

WEEKLY, 50 CENTS PER YEAR

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.

1801-1811 Fond du Lac Ave.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

LEADING ORGAN *of the* AMERICAN CHURCH

The . . .

American Church

• Monthly •

SELDEN PEABODY DELANY, D.D., EDITOR

The purpose of the *American Church Monthly* is to set forth the cause of the Catholic religion in the Anglican communion, and particularly in the American Episcopal Church. It does not profess to be a forum of debate in which all the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith may be assailed. It does not profess to represent all schools of thought in the Episcopal Church. Its aim is to present constructively the Catholic view on matters of faith, order, discipline, and worship. On minor matters which have not been authoritatively settled, opportunity is given for the expression of divergent opinions. The class of readers kept in view comprises the more intelligent among the clergy and laity who have a serious intellectual interest in the problems of religion and life. It does not aim to be a magazine exclusively for scholars; but neither does it aim to appeal to the unthinking, who never read anything but the more sensational of the daily newspapers.

Sixth Year Subscription \$3.00 Sample 25c

FACTS ABOUT CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D., is rector of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York City.

Rev. A. Parker Curtiss is chaplain of the Community of St. Mary, Peekskill, N. Y.

Rev. Hamilton Schuyler is rector of Trinity Church, Trenton, N. J.

Rev. John H. Yates is rector of St. Mark's Church, Waterville, Me.

Howard R. Patch, Ph.D., is associate professor of English at Smith College.

Mrs. John M. Glenn is President of the National Council, Church Mission of Help.

The American Church Monthly

A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

NEW YORK, N. Y.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: HON. WILLIAM J. TULLY, Corning, N. Y.

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Three Dollars a Year
Canadian subscription, \$3.25 a Year

Twenty-five Cents a Copy
Foreign subscription, \$3.50 a Year

VOL. XII

FEBRUARY, 1923

No. 6

EDITORIAL COMMENT

The Y. M. C. A. and the Church

WHY high Anglicans distrust the Y. M. C. A. and kindred organizations ought to appear from the decision on relationship to the Churches, taken at Atlantic City on November 16th, 1922, at the forty-first international convention of the Young Men's Christian Associations of North America. While recommending "adequate relationship" the commission urged, as reported by the *New York Times*, absolute independence of ecclesiastical control in association work. It asked of the Churches suggestions, but particularly "in enlisting personnel and financial support." This suggests that, while the Y. M. C. A. will not be controlled by the Church or the Churches, it it would gladly suck dry the resources of the Churches, or of the Church.

This may be, and perhaps is, all very well for some of the

Protestant denominations. A vague philanthropy is about what their idea of Christianity seems to be approaching. The Y. M. C. A. is an organ adapted to a vague philanthropy rather better than many of those Churches themselves. Why should not those Churches transfer their workers and finances to the more efficient instrument. If the Y. M. C. A. is beyond their control, still it is controlled by their spirit. That ought to satisfy them.

It is not so with the historic Church of Jesus. The Church cannot endure to see her strength and resources transferred to athletic and social uses colored by religious sentiment. Not such is the mission transmitted by apostles, witnessed by martyrs, adorned by kings, enforced by magistrates, reasoned by philosophers, lived by saints, inherited today by the thin black line that stands between Christian civilization and Bolshevism.

The Church will not accept sociology in place of theology, athletics for ascetics, business men's classes in the place of doctrinal teaching, nor the counsels of respectability for the counsels of perfection. The ideal of the Church is the New Jerusalem. The ideal of the Y. M. C. A. is a new New York. Many would accept this as favorable to the Y. M. C. A. A new New York is something practical. True, but the historic Church is hopelessly unpractical. *Non possumus* is written on every page of her record.

Faltering yet following, through the ages of mingled folly and fervor, her unearthly, unpracticable, unworkable ideal, the Church has always been foolishness to the intellectuals and a stumbling-block to practical men. Yet nearly all the intellectual achievement of men has been wrought in the Church's shadow or been preserved by the Church's moral influence on society. The practical men, without religion or ascetic morality, have just managed to construct the great destruction and call it Bolshevism. It was always so. The pillage of the monasteries and guilds for practical reasons created that practical mass of industrial misery that modern Social Service is still practically unable to assuage. The foolishness of Christian orthodoxy alone today clings to a definite metaphysic and a definite morality in the midst of shifting Pragmatisms and unstable popular ethics. The Church has little faith in the vision of a new New York, but she knows that the one chance in a thousand of coming anywhere

near it is that large numbers of New Yorkers should get the vision of the New Jerusalem.

So the Church must hold fast to her definite program and cannot think well of indefinite and scattering tendencies. The local Y. M. C. A. forms a kind of religious center, without dogmas or strict ethical teaching or sacraments or supernatural ideal. Young Churchmen mingle with young unbelievers as though they were all one, as though the mushroom-sect of yesterday were a "sister" of the Church of the ages. The Bible Classes teach the higher criticism, business ideals are substituted for evangelical ideals. The various workers and leaders either are not Churchmen or, if Churchmen, seldom seek the altar and never insist on the Church.

The Y. M. C. A. may have a work to do among those outside the Church. Churchmen on the other hand feel that their young people in the Y. M. C. A. will not be built up, but undermined.

Is the Church Obscurantist?

The charge is often brought against the Church that those who are authorized to speak for her are guilty of opposing the advance of knowledge. When we recall how some representatives of the Western Church in the sixteenth century opposed and denied the teaching of science in the matter of the Copernican astronomy and the treatment they accorded Galileo, and when we see the attitude taken by many contemporary Protestant spokesmen on the subject of evolution, we must admit that there is some ground for the charge.

A lay deputy from the South in the last General Convention is reported to have said that he was grieved to find that there were communicants of this Church who no longer believed that the world was made in six days of twenty-four hours each. He had never before suspected that any Churchman did not accept the Creation account in the first chapter of Genesis as literal history. This is an illustration which could easily be multiplied and shows how much ignorance of the Bible is still to be found among our laity. We believe the clergy are not without blame. To be sure, they have not extensive opportunities to convey to all the laity (especially to those who rarely come to church) the instruction that is needed on this and many other subjects, but

it is to be feared that they do not sufficiently use what opportunities they have to emphasize the fact that the function of the Bible is to teach not science nor history, but religion.

Much harm is done by thus allowing Church people to retain in their minds so many erroneous views about the Bible. The harm is especially evident among our young people. As soon as they go to college they hear professors poking fun at what they call the old, orthodox views, or they read books like H. G. Wells' *Outline of History*; and they then realize for the first time that the early chapters of Genesis are not literal and accurate accounts of the origin and development of the world. Thereupon they are inclined to throw over all their religious opinions and in many cases lose faith in God and the Church. They assume that if the views which they held about the Bible are mistaken, therefore everything in the Bible must be untrustworthy, and also everything that their parents and the religious teachers of their childhood have taught them must be thrown into the rubbish heap.

It cannot be too frequently insisted upon that the Catholic Church does not guarantee the historical truth of every statement in the Bible. It guarantees the truth only of such statements as are set forth in the creeds and other official formularies of the whole Catholic Church. In other words, every statement in the Bible which accords with the Church's Creeds, such as the accounts of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of our Lord, are to be taken as historically true, not because they appear in the Bible, but because the Church has taught them from the beginning as part of the Catholic Faith. Other passages in the Bible, such as the story of the flood or of the building of the tower of Babel, or the story of Jonah and the whale, or the narrative of the experiences of Job, have never been guaranteed by the Church as being accounts of historical facts. They are to be taken on their face value as bits of Semitic folk-lore or Hebrew fiction or drama. The book of Job was undoubtedly a Hebrew drama.

The main question that we should always ask about any passage of the Bible is, what *religious* teaching is conveyed by that passage? That would be our main interest in the early chapters of Genesis. We should not go to them to seek information about

prehistoric events or the early history of the world. To discover such facts we should go to the sciences of anthropology or geology or archaeology. The chief value for us in the early chapters of Genesis lies in the fact that the inspired writer incorporated into his narrative certain bits of Semitic folk-lore in such a way as to make them the vehicle of religious teaching.

In the December number of *Theology*, there is an excellent article on "The Early Chapters of Genesis". The argument of the writer is of the same general nature as that which we have outlined. In answer to the question, what is the religious teaching conveyed in the early chapters of Genesis, the writer admirably sums it up as follows:

1. That the world and everything in it was created by God, and was declared by Him to be good.

2. That man, when he appeared on the scene, was without sin, which I take to mean, not virtuous but innocent.

3. That man sinned by disobedience, that is by consciously setting his own will against God's.

4. That the fall of man was due to the desire for knowledge.

5. That, as time went on, man fell more and more deeply into sin; and that each successive stage in his spiritual decline was accompanied by a corresponding advance in material knowledge, prosperity and skill.

We wish that some of our learned seminary professors, especially those whose duty it is to teach the exegesis of the Scriptures, would plan some sort of an outline of lectures that might be given by the clergy to their people on the subjects of the Bible and its interpretation. What needs to be emphasized, at present, especially, is the interpretation of the Old Testament. There is not so much trouble arising from the interpretation of the New Testament. If this were done, then all of the clergy who really cared to enlighten their people on these matters could prepare such a course of lectures and give it at suitable times.

Decency in Literature

Christian people should be grateful to Professor John Erskine for his admirable article on decency in literature in the November number of the *North American Review*. After a careful and discriminating analysis he makes abundantly clear

what must be our standards of judging whether a particular piece of literature is indecent.

This is a subject that has recently been brought prominently before the public. The name of John S. Sumner is connected in the popular mind with an elaborate attempt to censor indecent literature. The main result of his work thus far seems to have been that many thoroughly disreputable novels have received gratis much valuable advertising and that their sale has thereby been enormously increased. It is undeniable that the method commonly adopted in this country for suppressing immoral books is exactly the method best calculated to increase their circulation. Perhaps Mr. Sumner has been retained by the publishers.

There is just one defensible way of dealing with such books, and that is to let them alone. Those who desire to read disgustingly immoral books will seek them out; but the general public, if their attention is not forcibly attracted to them, will ignore them. The publishers will soon discover that it is not profitable for them to publish such books. This proposal is so obvious that it seems utterly trite and commonplace; yet, strangely enough, it is often the most obvious principles that seem to escape the attention of many of our self-appointed supervisors of public morals.

Shall We Recognize Soviet Russia?

There are many who are bringing much pressure to bear on the government authorities at Washington to get them to recognize the Soviet government of Russia. It is of course easy to advance arguments for such recognition. It seems very ungracious for us to refuse to have dealings with so large a section of the earth's population as the people of Russia, just because we do not approve of the present regime under which they are living. Why should we try to dictate to another people what kind of a government they shall have?

Nevertheless, there are serious reasons why civilized nations should have no dealings with such a despotism as that which has entrenched itself at Moscow. The primary reason is that their conduct has been that of the lowest kind of barbarians in their attitude toward the Christian Church. They have carried on a

systematic campaign of profanation of holy things and places with the avowed purpose of breaking down the religious habits of the people. As if it were not enough that they have murdered countless numbers of priests and bishops, they are now vying with each other in desecrating the holy relics of the Church. They have broken open the shrines containing relics of saints, torn the vestments from their bodies and exposed the naked corpses to the vulgar gaze and dirty hands of scoffers. As one instance of this sort of thing we may quote a description of the desecration that was perpetrated upon the remains of the Blessed Andrew of Bobola, which had reposed in the famous church at Polock in the district of Witebsk for nearly three hundred years. The description we here quote is from the official account as reported to the Polish Foreign Office. We are indebted for it to *America*, of December 2nd:

The order to open the coffin of Bl. Andrew Bobola was given to the local authorities of Polock on June 23, 1922. The city learned of the sacrilegious project by means of two statements posted on the *Ispolkom* and the railway station. These notices were posted at ten o'clock in the morning. At the same hour the church was surrounded by soldiers and it was prohibited that anyone should enter. The desecration took place at noon. From among the Catholics Dr. Christenzen was called, who took part in the proceedings in the quality of an expert, but did not touch the relics. A few other Catholics went inside the church with the commission without being seen. After breaking the seals and cracking open the lock of the coffin the agents of the *Ispolkom* tore away the alb. Then the coffin, still containing the relics, despoiled of their vestments, was placed on end and vigorously shaken. Despite this, the relics remained intact. When the desecrators perceived it they were simply overwhelmed, one was heard to exclaim, "It is astonishing how the remains have been preserved." On leaving the church the Soviet agents seemed almost abashed. The Catholic population gathered outside the church did not actively intervene in defense of the relics but they manifested their indignation in unmistakable terms. In this they were joined by Orthodox Russians and Jews. The relics presented the following appearance: (description deleted). After the commission left the population was allowed to enter and look upon the relics. The attitude of the people was grave.

There may be Americans who, after reading such an account, would still feel that we should recognize the Soviet government of Russia. We should as soon enter into negotiations with hell, as with such fiends. We are grateful that we have such a man as Mr. Hughes at the head of our State Department, and that he

has thus far stood out resolutely again having any intercourse with Soviet Russia.

Attacks on Religion in Colleges

One of the instructors in a large university, in lecturing recently to a class of freshmen, told them that nobody of normal intelligence nowadays believed in the Christian religion. One of the members of the class spoke up and said that the psychological tests required for entrance to the University had shown him to be of normal intelligence, and that he still believed in the Church's creed and intended to study for the priesthood.

Many college authorities profess to be deeply exercised when any of their professors make attacks upon the sacred right of private property or venture to question the wisdom of war as a means of composing international quarrels. But apparently they are indifferent to attacks upon God and the very fundamentals of the Christian religion. Considering the origin, purpose and history of most of our colleges, things have indeed come to a lamentable pass when an instructor can be permitted to make such absurd and untrue statements to a class of freshmen.

Further Light on the Functions of Co-consecrators

In a footnote to "Mgr. Barnes on Anglican Orders" in the December number of this Monthly, reference was made to a work by Gillmann, *Zur Lehre der Scholastik vom Spender der Firmung und des Weihesakraments* (Paderborn, 1920). Dr. Franz Gillmann is Professor of Canon Law in the Catholic Faculty of Theology at the University of Wuerzburg in Bavaria, and is well known to canonists by his studies in the functions of the ancient *chorepiscopi*, as well as for frequent contributions to the *Archiv fuer kath. Kirchenrecht* and to *Der Katholik*.

He has recently (Wuerzburg, 1922) published a small brochure, entitled (in German) *The Minister and Outward Sign in Episcopal Consecration according to Huguccio*. This is a detailed investigation of the teaching upon this point of "one of the first and most famous of mediaeval canonists". Huguccio was born in Pisa about the middle of the twelfth century, studied

and later taught Canon Law at Bologna, that home of all mediæval legal lore, and in 1190 was made Bishop of Ferrara in Lombardy. He is especially famous for his *Summa* to the *Decretum* of Gratian, which had appeared some forty years earlier. His most distinguished pupil was Lothario de Conti, who in 1198 became pope as Innocent III. The latter frequently consulted his former teacher on points of Church Law, and portions of his correspondence were taken up as elements in later codifications. Huguccio died in 1210, just five years before Innocent inaugurated the great Lateran Council of 1215. Thus we have the right to adjudge the canonical doctrines of Huguccio to be fairly expressive of the belief of the mediæval Church in its grandest and most vigorous days—those opening years of the thirteenth century.

His thought on the number and functions of the ministers of episcopal consecration, as presented by Professor Gillmann, is as follows: 1, In order to avoid invalidity of consecration, three bishops are required. 2, The triple number of consecrators was instituted and ordained by the Apostles. 3, As type and model of this, Peter, James, and John consecrated James the Less first bishop of Jerusalem. 4, There is no need of more than three bishops at an episcopal consecration, but there cannot for validity be less than three. 5, If only one bishop were left on earth, no further bishops could be consecrated. 6, Even the pope cannot consecrate with only one assistant bishop. 7, Of course, the pope, or the whole Church, or a Divine Revelation might alter these regulations but otherwise they stand. 8, Each and all of the three consecrators consecrates, yet each along with the others. 9, Thus on the part of the consecrators there are three consecrations, yet on the side of the consecrand only one—just as when three persons carry one stone.

The above digest perhaps speaks for itself, and we would only stress the following points:

Huguccio's outlook is indisputably mediæval; whatever was the current practice of the Western Church must have been originated by the Apostles.

This renders his witness all the stronger. He is evidently not introducing a theory, but is arguing from the (to him) universal and well-known practice of the Church.

As his date is some two centuries prior to the Council of Florence (1439), when Eastern and Western sacramental teaching largely interacted, this may be taken as genuine mediaeval Western belief. It is, of course, in direct contradiction to the earlier Western teaching, as witnessed by Gregory the Great, nevertheless it is in striking harmony with the later Russian doctrine, which was quoted in the above article.

The illustration used by Huguccio represents the general Anglican attitude. Each consecrator really consecrates, yet so as to effect but one consecration, as when three persons carry one stone, i. e., one of the persons may stumble and even fall, but the stone will still be supported by the other two.

Mr. Holmes and Judaism

The Reverend John Haynes Holmes, pastor of the Community Church in New York, which is based upon the principle that religious uniformity is unnecessary, and that people may gather together for worship and instruction without professing any creed, has recently dropped the name of Jesus from his covenant. These are his words: "We took the name of Jesus from our covenant and thus sought definite release from all that fell short of a genuinely universal faith. The bulk of the membership still remains Gentile. But immediately there came and are still coming Jewish men and women."

Rabbi Samuel Schulman of Temple Beth-El, Fifth Avenue and Seventy-sixth Street, has made the following searching criticism of the position of Mr. Holmes:

I deny that such a theistic church is necessarily more universal than our Judaism or than Christianity in its various forms. Does not Mr. Holmes see that what he calls an inclusive principle immediately acts as a force of exclusion for millions in this city? Does he not see that by giving up Christianity, and, as he says, taking the name of Jesus from the covenant of his church, he makes it impossible for millions of citizens of this great community to worship with him?

I might in all seriousness say to him, If you have given up Christianity and removed Jesus from the covenant, why do you not, as did some fine spirits of the Gentile world in the course of our history, come to the household of Israel, identify yourself with the Jew and accept Judaism as a religion?

regard to it. It was Dr. Pusey who sent him to Father Benson, it was Father Grafton who set the ball rolling.

But when we turn to the biography to find out the thousand and one things we yearn to know from one who knew them so well, we find they have no mention in its pages. A few bare dates, some scattered information casually set down to explain some less important fact, serve but to whet the appetite for the longed for information. There is much that is priceless in its interpretation as to the sort of man Bishop Grafton was spiritually, but as a picture of his life and times as he moved among stirring events, it is a disappointment.

But I have often felt that he lacked the gift of narrative. Few great preachers have been so sparing of anecdote in their sermons. The garrulity of the clerical *bon raconteur* was an offense to him. In spite of a varied experience in which he had met with many kinds of men and women, and the things unusual people do and say, he rarely mentioned anything like the sort of thing the usual clerical story teller entertains his listeners with. I can recall but two; one an instance of miraculous healing through contact with the Blessed Sacrament, and the other a humorous occurrence at a visitation after he became a bishop. He charged me not to speak about either. His published works reveal the sort of man he was spiritually; he left men to think of him as they would in other regards.

One of the characteristics that help to explain him as a man, and fill in the gaps in the story of his life, was his love of adventure. He lacked the cold conservatism one might have expected in one of his ancestry and upbringing. He had no particular reverence for a thing simply because it was old. He was not afraid to make ventures of faith. He was unafraid of failure.

He appreciated the romance of religion. So it is easy to reconstruct the story of his conversion to the Church. This new presentation of Christianity was the sort to appeal to the sort of boy he was. What events led to his confirmation we can only imagine, but on May 18, 1851, a few weeks after his twenty-first birthday, he was confirmed in St. Stephen's Chapel, Boston, and he may be easily reckoned as one of the first fruits of the Catholic Revival in this country.

He belonged to a very exclusive set of the old aristocracy of

Boston. He was one of the handsomest young men in town. He was noted as a fine dancer. This last we can well believe. His exquisite grace of manner, his stately walk, his erect and imposing way of carrying himself, must have been seen to their best advantage in the leisurely minuets, the lancers and quadrilles of his day. One can never forget his manner of approaching the altar for his mass. It was the humble, grave recollection of the subject, carefully prepared for his admission to Majesty.

In the year of his confirmation Grafton entered the Harvard Law School. Once the building where he lived and the window of his room were pointed out to me. When I passed the University this Summer the memory of both was gone from me, but someone who knows or who can find out ought to see that the room is marked to preserve the association of a place with a name the old school may well be proud to remember.

Into his student life he carried the religion which had so attracted him. In days when the idea of fasting communion was well-nigh forgotten in Boston, he went to make his communion in the early morning. As time went on, along with his other studies he went deeper into the facts of his professed faith. The Catholic doctrines of the priesthood, the Real Presence and the like, took strong hold on him.

The spirit of adventure had something to do with leading him into the Church. Now it was to lead him still further. He had been interested in the political side of the anti-slavery question. The Bar was a step towards political eminence, but the Church pulled the other way. Let him tell it in his own words: "I believed in the Church and I said, 'Though I shall not live to see her recover her heritage of doctrine and ritual in my day, it is well for a man to give up his life in an endeavor to bring a revival of the Church to pass. It is a greater work to free the Church than it is even to free the slave. For my own poor part, I will throw my hat into the ring and do what I can in the fight.'" So to the Great Adventure young Grafton dedicated his life. He spent a night in prayer in Trinity Church in New York praying among other things that his life might be taken away, even in an accident, rather than that he should live on and proclaim the Catholicity of the Church if it were not true. In the midst of his sermon at the translation of the Bishop from

the cemetery to the cathedral, Fr. Huntington exclaimed, "You know that Bishop Grafton would have died for his religion." It was true. It was a part of him, and to spread it was the great adventure of his life.

When Charles Grafton offered himself to Bishop Whittingham of Maryland as a candidate for the Sacred Ministry we do not know what were the sentiments of his family. To have thrown over prospects of the most brilliant kind, social, political and financial, might well have given offense to those whose traditions were so opposed to all that now engaged his mind and interests. That he spent the beginnings of his ministry in a poverty that was very real is an indication that he had to some extent cut himself off from the family ties and the help of those who if they had sympathized with him might have relieved him of what seemed like actual deprivation and suffering. He became curate to a priest who had charge of some country work, and he camped out in a deserted rectory where for six months' work he received the sum of twenty-six dollars. Four persons assembled to hear the first sermon of him who was to fill the new Church of the Advent with listeners eager to hear his message. For ten years he remained in Maryland, doing hard and ill-paid work in positions of subordination.

Another characteristic of Father Grafton's for which he has not always been given sufficient credit, was a clarity of vision as to what was *fundamental* in the Faith. I have always felt that he cared little for ritual as a thing in itself. He felt that the worship of Almighty God needed what was formal, stately and imposing, but he was not very particular as to the form it took. I should say he was rather inaccurate in ritual matters. The important thing was that public worship should have in it elements that made an appeal to the instinct for the splendid and mysterious that goes along with man's religious feelings. Later he came to see that it was well to adhere to what was traditional and easily mastered. He had no predilection for what was "English" or "Sarum". If a living rite like the Roman could be appealed to, that it was Roman did not affect him. He did indeed wish that some regard should be paid to ritual of the Orthodox Church, and in his Cathedral arranged that there should be seven instead of ~~six~~ tall lights on the altar; though the

"seven golden candlesticks" of the Apocalypse were as likely to have struck his mind as Orthodox custom.

So now during those years of comparative obscurity in Maryland, the fundamental things of the Faith became clear in his mind. The real Presence, Eucharistic worship and the Reserved Sacrament became the sum and center of his religion. He saw it was the Mass that mattered. Then he became convinced that the revival of the Religious Life was necessary in the revival of Catholicity in the Church. This was almost the most revolutionary thing he could have thought of. Nothing struck more deeply at the prejudices and fears of Protestantism. He must have seen, as I have, the ruin of the convent destroyed by a Protestant mob in Charlestown. But he saw that the Religious Life carried along with it renunciations and ideals which opposed themselves to the root principles of Protestantism, and which needed to be emphasized and recognized in the Church.

So while he was not the cause, he was the occasion of the revival of the Life for men in the Church. While others thought and studied as much as he, it was he who took the decisive step that led to the crystallization of what had been long inchoate.

So here we seem to have the secret of the man. The spirit of adventure made him unafraid to attempt the impossible, and indifferent to predicted failure. His clarity of vision as to fundamentals made him see just the things most needed to make his throwing his "hat into the ring" effective, and we see him thus a Father indeed of the Catholic Revival among us, setting up the standard and clearing the ground for all that came after. Now that the smoke of battle has cleared away, we must admit that that splendid figure stands there in the thick of the fight, the monk fighting for the Mass.

It is not so hard now after all these years to understand why for so long he seemed to be distrusted by those of his side, as well as those who were opposed to him. His merciless logic seemed to ignore the safe course, yet he belonged to a school that had deemed the "expedient" as the best way. Once granted that the Religious Life might be lived in the American Church, and the Mass made the center of the spiritual life, all the traditions of his life pulled him down to a line that irked other spirits who weighed the issue with

less wisdom and clear thinking. He wanted to make good the gains as he went. He had a passion for making things safe. His legal training and his natural acumen led him to place too many safeguards about some of the things he built up. Those who never realized the danger and difficulty of his position in Boston for many of the years of his life there were free to criticise the caution with which he proceeded in some of his courses, and they attributed to the tact, willingness to yield in nonessential things, and finesse with which he sought to create an atmosphere in which he might push the fight for essentials, a dishonesty of mind which was far from him. He took human nature as he found it, and with weak, sometimes unworthy, material he did as seemed the best at the time to, as he used in his later years to express it,—“press on the Kingdom.”

When Father Grafton became Bishop, he had passed the dangerous parts of his road, and without fear he set out to give certain things a place in the life of the Church. It is not the place or time to tell what he did in his Diocese or Cathedral Church, but he pressed the mark of Catholicity on them both. The time had come, he thought, when a bold stand might be taken. External things might well now be pushed to set forth the things which they signified.

I well remember how he used to say that he wanted to see a rood screen in every church in the diocese. He supplied the funds for many. Some of them are rather worse than “churchwarden Gothic”, for his taste in architecture had never been much developed; but they were revivals that stood for the Catholic character of the Church, and were neither Roman nor Protestant. They were to his mind characteristic of the English Church, and seemed to set forth an aspect of her life which seemed in the providence of God destined to lead towards a reunion of Christendom. The screen he used to say emphasized the retirement and modesty of the Anglican Communion. The rood set forth her presentation of Christ and Him crucified, and the air of mystery, her severe and austere insistence on the subjective side of religion.

The consecration of his coadjutor bishop, Dr. Weller, was a new starting point in his career. Here he flung down the gauntlet, as it were, and set forth to all the world the claim to all the

heritage of the Church. The storm of protest it aroused brought back all the old "hat in the ring" spirit, and he never flinched in his defense of what he done or what it implied. From that day forward, in spite of what he had done, his influence in the House of Bishops probably grew all the stronger. Now he had cast all the restraints of safety to the winds, and stood forth as the fearless defender of the faith and practice of the undivided Church. He was no longer hampered by the old fetters of expediency. He was a bishop who was not afraid, and those who opposed him must see to it that they were as well grounded as he in the merits of the controversy.

There are those who will admit all I have said, but will recall those defects which went along with the splendid qualities they have come to recognize. Yes, he had the defects of his virtues. Such a temperament as his must have had its other side of impetuosity, impatience and sensitiveness. His clear vision made him resent what seemed like ignorant attempts to thwart him. The turn of mind that led him to think of the Law and Politics as the sphere of his life work made him sensitive to what people thought and to their reactions.

These were fearful handicaps, when we reduce them to the plain English of a quick temper, impatience of restraint, and sensitiveness to public opinion. How few of us would have made such a struggle as he made! Those of us who knew him best, knew how the outburst of temper was succeeded by penitence and apology. It was almost pitiful to see how abject were the apologies he made after he had broken out in anger. In so great a man, temper did not seem so out of place, as the humbling in the very dust that succeeded it. Yes, he had these defects, but it is a very small mind indeed which can remember them so well, as to dim the memory of the splendor that was his. No other bishop was so much a Prince of the Church as Bishop Grafton in his canonicals. As he walked up his Cathedral Church at the end of a procession one felt that here was a Bishop who believed himself to be a successor of the Apostles, sent to rule, reign, teach, admonish and if need be, punish. He magnified his office. And who, apart from the temper, ever saw Bishop Grafton do an undignified thing? I remember long before I became a priest, in a letter he wrote me bearing on the life to which I was looking

forward, he said: "We must never forget the solemnity of our dedicated lives." That was it, the solemnity of his dedicated life. He never forgot it.

Bishop Grafton, as all great men must have, had his enemies. The man without an enemy is a poor thing, spineless and colorless. He had his defects, as have all men, great or small. But to those who knew him, he stands apart as one who was for some special purpose, pre-eminent as a Father of the Catholic Revival in America; one who helped immensely in the Revival of the Religious Life for men; a great teacher of the faith; a preacher who had a special gift of appeal to men's consciences; a safe spiritual guide; a fearless fighter for Catholic truth; a great bishop; a trusted leader; a faithful friend; a man who knew the depths of penitence; and an humble Christian.

Other men and other bishops have their work set before them by God, and it may be in His providence that the work they do, unnoticed, unpraised, and less appreciated, may be as much to His praise or glory; but it is surely right that to this man, set in the high places of the earth, due praise and honor should be given, that the rest of us may be heartened and inspired to follow along where he blazed the trail.

Other Sheep Not of This Fold

No. V.

THE METHODISTS

REV. HAMILTON SCHUYLER

THE Methodists, unlike those bodies dealt with in previous articles, were not the offspring of Puritanism. When the Methodist movement arose Puritanism had spent its first force and no longer exercised a dominating influence over English Christianity. In reality Methodism was a vehement protest against Calvinistic Puritanism, though in its later developments it has tended to adopt current Puritanical standards of conduct as opposed to the Catholic principle of liberty in things morally indifferent in themselves.

Historically Methodism sprang out of that movement within the English Church known as the Evangelical Revival which had its beginnings in the early part of the eighteenth century. At that period the religious life of England was at a deplorably low ebb. There was indeed a keen interest in theological controversy. In fact an undue part of the energy of the clergy and others charged with the interests of religion was absorbed in the defense of orthodoxy against the attacks of the deists and other infidels of the day. During this age the English Church produced a number of profound dialecticians, intellectual giants like Bishop Butler, Waterland and Walburton, who successfully defended the claims of Christianity against all gainsayers. But while the Christian faith was ably vindicated on its intellectual side there was a dearth of instruction in the practical truths of religion so far as the plain people were concerned. Christianity was regarded by the majority of educated men rather as a thesis to be defended than as a life to be lived. Appeals were addressed rather to the reason than to the heart. Sermons were coldly argumentative. It was considered bad taste to make any appeal to the emotions. That which today the clergy esteem their foremost duty, namely, to present Christianity in such a manner as to induce men to lead holy lives was at that time sadly neglected. The parish clergy in those days, as the clergy of the Church of England commonly have been, were educated gentle-

men, but they were often shockingly careless of their pastoral obligations. Many of them were pluralists, that is to say, they received the income from two or more parishes without rendering the equivalent of any personal services. Incumbents frequently delegated their duties to underpaid curates. In cases where they did live in their parishes, beyond holding the required services on Sundays, they often did little else. The children were not taught, the poor and the sick were not regularly sought out and ministered to. Often instead of preaching sermons of their own composition they read the dry theological disquisitions of others. Naturally the popular interest in religion and the church services was small. In many country places the people grew up in practical heathenism. Of course it must not be inferred that there was a total neglect everywhere of their duties by the clergy. There were undoubtedly notable instances of parish priests who did their work conscientiously and with a real love for the souls committed to their care. But it is certain that the spirit of the times was one of general religious apathy and deadness. What the age desperately needed was something that would stir men's hearts and set them aglow. Orthodoxy had been vindicated; what was now required was an enthusiasm that would transform intellectual conviction into religious living. Men had come to regard Christianity very much as a system of philosophy. They had need to be taught that it was essentially a life.

William Law, the author of "The Serious Call," is usually regarded as the precursor of the revival of religion out of which Methodism sprang. But the chief figure of the Evangelical Revival and the founder of Methodism was John Wesley.

In the year 1726 John Wesley, a fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, his brother Charles, George Whitefield, Hervey, the author of the "Meditations," and about a dozen other earnest young men formed themselves into a society for mutual edification in religious learning and holy living. This is Wesley's own account of it. "In November, 1727, at which time I came to reside at Oxford, my brother and I and two or three young gentlemen more, agreed to spend three or four evenings a week together. On Sunday evening we read something in divinity, on other nights the Greek and Latin classics. In the following

summer we were desired to visit the prisoners in the castle and we agreed to visit them twice a week. Soon after we were desired to call upon a poor woman in town who was sick and in this employment too we believed it would be worth while to spend an hour or two in every week. Soon after we all agreed to communicate as often as we could (which was then once a week) in Christ Church. In April, 1732, Mr. Clayton of Brasenose College, began to meet with us. It was by his advice we began to observe the fasts of the Ancient Church every Wednesday and Friday. This was the beginning of the Methodist Society."

Perhaps it is not strange that the earnest self-devoted lives of these young men should have brought down upon them in those days the wonder and ridicule of the careless and irreligious among their fellow students. They were called in derision the "Holy Club", "Bible Bigots", "Methodists", the latter term as applying to the strictness of their habits and the fact that they lived by rule. They accepted for themselves this appellation "Methodist" scornfully bestowed and proceeded to make it famous.

The original members of the Methodist Society, who, be it observed, all belonged to the Church of England and most of whom subsequently received holy orders, met with great encouragement at first from the ecclesiastical authorities. Dr. Benson, the Bishop of Gloucester, being struck with the remarkable ability of Whitefield, sent for him and although he lacked two years of attaining the canonical age, being only 21, ordained him to the ministry. When Whitefield preached his first sermon it was told the Bishop that its fervor was so great that fifteen people had been driven mad. The Bishop replied that he hoped the madness would not be forgotten before the next Sunday. Dr. Potter, Archbishop of Canterbury, recognizing the great ability of Wesley as an evangelistic preacher, marked out a line of conduct for him. "Do not," he said, "spend your time in controversy but in attacking the strongholds of vice and in promoting personal holiness."

The early part of the Methodist movement was carried on in strict accordance with Church principles and the Wesleys and their companions were loyal adherents to the doctrine, discipline

and worship of the Church. It was their great mission to arouse enthusiasm, to awaken spiritual life, to rouse men from their formalism and to press home upon the heart and the conscience the necessity of repentance and holy living. In this work they were wonderfully successful, as the sequel shows. The impress made upon religion in England and America by their labors is still abundantly felt after a century and a half. In connection with his evangelistic work, Wesley trained a body of lay preachers and provided for the gathering of his disciples into organized societies for mutual edification and support.

In 1735 John Wesley went as a missionary to Georgia but was compelled to leave after remaining only about two years, owing, it is said, to the rigor with which he sought to enforce Church discipline. He declined to bury a person not baptized by a minister episcopally ordained, he refused to admit persons who were not communicants as sponsors, he denied the communion to those whose conduct seemed to him inconsistent. The popular opinion of his conduct was expressed by one who said "The people say they are Protestants, but as for you they cannot tell what religion you are of. They never heard of such a religion before and they do not know what to make of it."

On his journey to Georgia and during his residence there Wesley made the acquaintance of some Moravian missionaries and imbibed from them certain doctrines which he proceeded to preach on his return to England. These new doctrines which Wesley made his own and which are still distinctive of the Methodist system are (1) the doctrine that instantaneous conversion through a spiritual cataclysm is the general mode of the Holy Spirit's dealing with the soul. This phenomenon was known as the "New Birth", the word which the New Testament and the Catholic Church for seven centuries had applied to the grace of Baptism. (2) The doctrine of Perfection, i. e., the doctrine that he that "is born of God" in this sudden conversion is at once translated from sin to holiness. Now these doctrines were not in accord with the teaching of the Prayer Book and when Wesley began to go up and down the country vehemently preaching them he found the pulpits of the Church in many instances closed against him. It was in vain that Wesley was remonstrated with by the Church authorities. He declined to abandon his teaching

on these points and continued to inveigh against the sober and scriptural teaching of the Church whose commission he bore. Finding the field of his activity growing narrower owing to the fact that he was unable to obtain use of the parish churches, meeting-houses were erected by Wesley and his sympathizers in which preaching services were held. For a long time the Methodists continued their attendance at the Church services and received the Sacrament regularly in their parish churches, only resorting to their chapels at hours when the Church buildings were closed. Gradually the breach between the Church and the followers of Wesley began to widen, though no definite schism occurred until after John Wesley's death.

Wesley always professed himself as bitterly opposed to his followers separating from the Church. His writings are full of exhortations to them to remain in full communion with it. He gave his lay preachers authority merely to preach and though often implored by them to give his consent to their administering the Sacraments refused to do so. In 1790, nine months before his death, he published in his own *Arminian Magazine* a strong protest against his followers separating from the Church. Speaking of the Methodists he says "They are not a sect or a party, they do not separate from the religious community to which they at first belonged. They are still members of the Church; such they desire to live and die. And I believe one reason why God is pleased to spare my life so long is to confirm them in their present purpose not to separate from the Church."

It has to be confessed that this declaration of Wesley's was greatly weakened by the fact that six years previously in 1784, moved by the anomalous condition of the Church in America, he had consented to appoint two clergymen as superintendents (Bishops) and two laymen as elders (Presbyters) to minister to his followers in that country. Charles Wesley refused to follow his brother in this presumptuous action and is said to have composed the following caustic epigram:

"How easy now are bishops made
By man or woman's whim,
Wesley his hand on Coke hath laid
But who laid hands on him?"

The delay on the part of English bishops in giving the Epis-

copate to the Church in America was the excuse Wesley offered for this schismatical proceeding. Had he been content to wait only a few weeks longer he would have found the desired Episcopate for America supplied by the consecration of Bishop Seabury.

John Wesley died in 1792. Three years following his death the Conference authorized the preachers to administer the sacraments and thus the secession which he had so strenuously sought to avoid was accomplished.

As previously observed the two characteristic doctrines of Methodism are those of the New Birth and of Perfection. The doctrine of the New Birth is a practical denial of the fact of Baptismal Regeneration. It assumes that a person is not made a Christian when he is christened but becomes so only when he has experienced a certain convulsive crisis of the inner life out of which he issues with a strong feeling of serenity and acceptance with God. This feeling is construed as "the witness of the Spirit with our spirit", and the person is supposed to be then for the first time justified, converted, made a Christian. Hence the main end of preaching is to produce this crisis. John Wesley in one of his sermons brings out this idea very clearly. Speaking of those who believe that they had received the New Birth in Baptism, he says of them, "The most common of the enthusiasts of this kind are those who imagine themselves Christians and are not. That they are not Christians is clear and undeniable, if we believe the oracles of God. For Christians are holy and these are unholy. Christians love God; these love the world. Yet they imagine themselves so to be, for they have been called so ever since they can remember, they were christened many years ago. Ah, poor self deceivers, Christians ye are not."

The second leading doctrine of Methodism is that of Perfection. The contention is that he that is born of God in sensible conversion is at once translated from sin to holiness so that he can boldly say of himself, "He that is born of God sinneth not." This doctrine of immediate sanctity is absolutely contrary to what the Church teaches. Holiness, according to Catholic teaching, is a growth, it is not to be attained at one bound. It is to be sought painfully and laboriously by the use of prayer, worship,

the sacraments and other means of grace. The Church has a doctrine of "assurance" but it is an assurance that will not permit the slackening of the least effort. The Church bids us ever remember that when we have done all that is required of us we are yet "unprofitable servants". The Church calls upon all her children to seek holiness, to strive for perfection, to climb up by the angel's ladder of her sacraments and outward helps to those calm heights of spiritual maturity where the danger of actually deviating from the right is infinitely lessened.

In accordance with the fissiparous tendency of sectarianism, dissenting bodies have from time to time split off from the Methodist stock until at the present time there are reckoned in this country some seventeen varieties. Of these by far the largest and most influential is the Methodist Episcopal, divided in two sections, Northern and Southern, with the colored churches likewise designated representing a combined membership of nearly seven million, and including the other varieties this brings the total membership of all bearing the Methodist name well up to eight million.

The Methodist Episcopal bodies are highly organized with definite headquarters and an efficient staff for propaganda and missionary purposes. The so-called Episcopal branches have officers bearing the title of bishop. These, however, do not constitute a separate order of the ministry but are simply general superintendents. The bishops are elected by the General Conference. They preside over the annual conferences and at the General Conference and appoint the ministers to their charges with the advice of the presiding elders.

The peculiarities of Methodist discipline are: (1) the probationary system by which converts are received for six months or more on trial when if the test results favorably they are then taken into "full connection" and have all the rights and privileges of full members; (2) the class meetings; the members and probationers of each church are divided into classes and meet under the care of a leader for prayer, testimony, and spiritual examination and advice; (3) exhortor-members licensed to hold meetings for prayer and exhortation; (4) local preachers—laymen adjudged to have gifts, graces and usefulness who are licensed to preach as occasion offers without giving up their

secular business, and may also be ordained as deacons and elders; (5) the itinerant system whereby the ministers are moved periodically from place to place, though this provision has been greatly modified in recent years.

Of all the bodies which have separated from the English Church there is none whose exodus is to be more regretted than that of the Methodists. The Church sustained a tremendous loss by the Methodist secession. Those who deserted her communion were her own children, bred in her fold and nurtured on her doctrines and sacraments.

Through the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century the Church has learned to prize religious enthusiasm and fervor as precious things and endeavors to direct and guide these forces into channels which she believes to be safe and permanently helpful. Thus instead of camp meetings and noisy revivals with their obvious dangers, she holds Parochial Missions, Retreats and Quiet Days; and in place of the class meetings she sanctions sacramental confession, devotional societies and communicant guilds. Above all, the duty of preaching to the plain people in a way that will attract and edify them is fully recognized if not invariably acted upon. Our preachers are no longer afraid to appeal to the emotions, for it is recognized that in the emotions are to be found the springs of religious action. Intellectual sermons may have an occasional place in the pulpit, since it is necessary to convince the understanding; but this is not sufficient and must be followed by a presentation of the vital truths of religion in such a way as to enlist the affections and arouse the sympathies.

It is a fact not to be disputed that Methodism has undergone a great change since its first days. It has become quieter and more conservative. It has shown an intelligent and increasing interest in the cause of education and it seeks in many instances to provide a public worship for its members that is more dignified and impressive than that usually found among Protestant bodies.

A great cause of thankfulness to Churchmen is found in the fact that an ever-increasing number of those who have been reared in the Methodist system are finding their way back to the Church of their forefathers. There is hardly a class for Con-

firmation in any parish which does not contain a number of Methodists. The piety, zeal and earnestness of these converts often put to shame many of those who have been brought up in the bosom of the Church.

It is in no spirit of arrogance that Churchmen venture to approach their Methodist brethren and earnestly invite them to reunite with the communion to which their ancestors belonged and which they loved. We willingly admit today that the fault which led to the schism was not wholly on their side but must be attributed in a large degree to the coldness, apathy and indifference which gripped the English Church during the period when Methodism took its rise. For these sins and shortcomings the Church has subsequently paid dearly in the loss of vast numbers which otherwise might have remained in her fold. Today there would seem to be no sufficient reason why devout and enlightened Methodists should not return to their former religious home. We commend to such the solemn words of their great founder, John Wesley, himself, who with his dying breath declared "I live and die a member of the Church of England, and none who regard my opinion or advice will ever separate from it."

The Steadfastness of Washington

REV. JOHN H. YATES

THERE is in a democracy a tendency to disbelieve in genius as an extraordinary manifestation of spiritual and mental qualities, and this disbelief is accompanied by an endeavor to place the great man on a level with his fellows. This probably accounts for the process, called by at least one of his biographers, "The unfreezing of Washington." To unfreeze a hero means, it would seem, to remove from him all those uncommon and heroic qualities which distinguish him from the ordinary man, or at least to dwell as little as possible upon them, and to make him appear to be very much like the average man, differing from the ordinary man only in the circumstances of life and the favorable opportunities of accomplishment which chance offered the hero above the usual. When we have succeeded, if we happen to be devotees of the "unfreezing" school, in bringing our great man down to our own level, his company is then more tolerable, more intimate, more warm, more comfortable, and we are then able to flatter ourselves by the supposition that we understand him quite well, and that we too, in his place, might have done as well as he did. We may suppose also that we have done him a kindness in making him better understood and more generally appreciated, and furthermore, that we have performed a service in the interest of truth. Among those who have helped to "unfreeze" Washington there seems to be a belief that they have succeeded in painting the portrait of the "true" Washington. They have done this by removing the mists of legend and making it possible for the light of common day to shine upon him. They have painted the "Washington" in very indistinct colors and the "George" stands out very clearly in the foreground. They seem not to understand that the symbolism of myth may better reveal the "true" nature of genius, which in the last analysis eludes explanation, than their prosaic delineation of facts. A good myth may be like a colored window: the white light of truth is broken up by the window, it is true, but still the colors which the window gives are in the sun's ray, and the effect may be very beautiful. Facts, on the

other hand, are very frequently like blocks of wood through which no light at all can shine.

How is the process of "unfreezing" accomplished? Usually by the narration of trifling incidents of daily life. We are told, in the case of Washington, how he ate, how he slept, what he said when he fell in love, how he lost his temper, and how he swore. That Washington swore gives the keenest delight to those of his biographers who have sought to unfreeze him. What warmth and color it gives to his life! How it humanizes him! How it brings him down with a thud to the general level! How much better we understand him, how much more we love him because he swore. A brief quotation, by way of illustration of the "unfreezing" process, may not be out of order. Here is one from *The True George Washington*, by Paul Leicester Ford: "Samuel Stearns states that Washington 'breakfasts about seven o'clock on three small Indian hoe-cakes, and as many dishes of tea,' and Custis remarks that 'Indian cakes, honey, and tea, formed this temperate repast.' These two writers tell us that at dinner 'he ate heartily, but was not particular in his diet, with the exception of fish, of which he was excessively fond. He partook sparingly of dessert, drank a home-made beverage, and from four to five glasses of Madeira wine. This, with one small glass of punch, a draught of beer, and two dishes of tea (which he takes half an hour before sun-setting) constitutes his whole sustenance till the next day.'" Only the genius of a Boswell is able to make such details interesting, and then they become interesting, not because they are facts, but because they are literature and are saved by the style of the writer. Such facts may be interesting also in an autobiography, in which case they are redeemed by the genius of the writer, and, in his hands, they may even give a little insight into his character, but hardly in the hands of another.

It is no injustice to Mr. Ford to quote from his book in this way. His whole book is quite designedly made up of just such little "touches." He tells us in the Preface that he seeks to humanize Washington and wishes to help offset the tendency which results in attributing superhuman qualities to national heroes, in this case Washington. He can understand, he says in effect, how this myth-creating process could have operated in

“ unscientific, primeval periods, but ” he continues, “ to all who have studied the creation of mythology, no phase is a more curious one than that the keen, practical American of today should engage in the same process of hero-building which has given us Jupiter, Wotan, King Arthur, and others.” But since everything has a cause, if only that cause can be discovered, and since nothing is “ curious ” to the scientist, in the sense of being uncaused, why not look for the cause of the phenomenon in question, and strive to understand how it is possible that the “ keen, practical American of today ” should “ engage in the same process of hero-building which has given us Jupiter. . . . ”? Not every man who happens to come into the public eye, or the public favor even, is made the subject of myth-building. Only those rare persons whose genius baffles even the “ keen, practical American ” are exalted to a place among the gods. The fact that Washington has been the subject of this process, has been semi-deified, if we may so speak, is the clearest and strongest proof of his unique greatness. “ It is the highest happiness of the thinking being,” said Goethe, “ to investigate what can be investigated, and silently to adore what cannot be explained.” If then there has been a certain amount of adoration of Washington, if he has been placed on the pedestal of Olympus, may we not infer that this is due to the fact that Washington cannot be explained nor understood quite so easily as, let us say, our next door neighbor? The “ unfreezing ” of Washington, or of any other truly great man, may be carried too far even in the interest of truth. The “ true ” Washington may be farther from the truth than the most ideal and poetic representation of him. What insight into the nature of genius is to be derived from the consideration that the man of genius eats and sleeps and falls in love like other men? That he should do these things is to be taken for granted. They are acts common to all men. But genius is not common to all men. It is exceedingly rare. What we want to know, therefore, about the man of genius is, How did he differ from other men? That he belonged to the *genus homo* may be taken for granted. Where then is the point in “ humanizing ” him? We do want to know, however, his outstanding qualities of mind and character, and valuable indeed is the least speck of light which may be thrown upon these. Therefore the old idealization of Washington was better than the new

humanization of him. The old idealization of Washington was an attempt, usually quite sincere and honest and born of a deep veneration, to throw some light upon the nature of his greatness, whereas the new humanization of him is little more than a detailed and long-drawn-out way of saying that he was, after all, a man. The old way of approach, moreover, sprang from a truer evaluation of Washington and a deeper insight into the nature of genius. It knew quite well that it did not understand the whole of the subject, whose nature it nevertheless felt constrained to do its best to describe, much as a preacher seeks to portray the transcendent nature of Christ's Divine Personality, though feeling quite inadequate to the task. In biography, as in religion, we are compelled to use symbols when we seek to bring within the reach of our minds those profound realities which elude the more exact, but also more limited, dialectic of the reason. Such a use of symbolism is quite justified and nothing is gained for the cause of truth by its abandonment. After Goethe had paid a visit to Beethoven he said of the great composer, "His genius amazed me!" The fact that the genius of Beethoven could amaze Goethe, himself one of the world's greatest men, throws no little light upon the greatness of Beethoven. The remark explains nothing, to be sure, but it creates a sentiment of admiration for Beethoven, which is genius' due.

Taking the great man, then, as he is, and waiving all theories as to his origin together with any wish to "unfreeze" him, we find that there is in him an element of mystery which is both baffling and exceedingly fascinating. It is the mystery of genius, a mystery which both invites investigation and, at the same time, eludes it, and so presents a problem of never-tiring interest. Perhaps the best explanation of the nature of genius is that explanation, which is at least as old as Plato, which is based on the hypothesis that the man of genius is in close touch with the divine. There is something that partakes of the divine in the way in which a great man becomes the center and focus of many and powerful forces, in whom even conflicting forces are many times reconciled, as well as in the permanence of his accomplishment, its persistent changelessness in a world wherein all things change. He becomes, in the measure of his greatness, a Plato to this Heraclitian world of flux. We may not be able to put our feet into the same stream twice, but it does seem to be possible

for us, in respect of a great man, to bathe our souls in his refreshing spirit, not twice only but many times. The spiritual permanence which is his, is wonderfully satisfying and is another cause for gratitude. Moreover, the truly great man is like a window through which we look out upon a new and finer world, or, to use another figure, he is like a powerful lens that magnifies, in our eyes, the importance of virtue, of noble conduct and of truth. He becomes a kind of prophet, speaking to us of God. In him we see, as in a mirror, the image of God, distorted much, doubtless, by human flaws, but still beautiful in our eyes, because finer than anything we can behold elsewhere. He becomes in a sense, therefore, a manifestation of the Absolute, and we may apply to him, to quote Goethe again, these words: "Of the Absolute in the theoretical sense I do not venture to speak; but this I maintain, that if a man recognizes it in its manifestations and always keeps his eye fixed upon it, he will reap a very great reward."

Leaving the general and coming to the particular, I think we may say that there is in every great man some outstanding virtue by which we may justly characterize him. Not, of course, that he is devoid of other virtues. That would be impossible and its supposition absurd, for the virtues never travel separately, but where one is, there all are present. Nevertheless, either because of inherited tendencies, or because of outward circumstances, one virtue may shine forth with especial splendor in a given individual. By way of illustration, we may compare Washington and Lincoln. What virtue above all others did Lincoln exemplify? Was it not sincerity? Is not this proved by the nick-name employed so tenderly, yet reverently, by those who knew and loved him best: "Honest Abe"? Lincoln is praised for the possession of many other virtues besides sincerity, it is quite true, but this one fine moral quality stands forth conspicuously before all the rest and may be called the cornerstone of his greatness. He could not be cajoled, nor turned aside, nor bent out of shape, no matter what pressure might be brought to bear on him. Not even his great-hearted charity, nor his deep humility, both of which were fruits of his sincerity, could induce him to refrain from the conflict he deplored, while there were principles at stake. Honesty for him was not the best policy: it was the breath of his life. Washington, too, was

sincere and his honesty has been emphasized by the familiar saying that "he could not tell a lie." Yet honesty was not the characteristic virtue of Washington, notwithstanding the famous story of the Cherry Tree. Washington's characteristic virtue was steadfastness. There is a Greek word which names this quality as it existed in Washington, better, perhaps, than any English word can do, namely *υπομονη*, which is defined in English as "a bearing up under, endurance, perseverance, patient waiting for." It is the word which occurs in the Greek original of the Gospel parable of The Sower. It is translated in the King James' Version "patience." Moffatt, however, in his "New Translation of the New Testament" renders it "steadfastness." Not this one word only, but the entire concluding verse of that beautiful parable may, without violence, be applied to Washington—"But that (seed) on the good ground are they, which in an honest and a good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with steadfastness." Upon the good ground of Washington's great heart fell the seed of a noble purpose, a purpose in many respects directly in line with the purpose of the Gospel itself. Moreover, he was quite conscious of that purpose. "Our cause," he said, "is noble. It is the cause of mankind." There were times when he might have said of this cause words spoken by One far greater of His own work: "How am I straightened till it be accomplished!" "I know," he said, "the unhappy predicament I stand in. . . . I know that without men, without arms, without ammunition, without anything fit for the accommodation of a soldier, little is to be done. . . . My own situation feels so irksome to me at times, that, if I did not consult the public good, more than my own tranquility, I should long ere this have put everything to the cast of a die." He was surrounded by indifference and hostility, was without money or munitions, without such bare necessities as food and clothing, many times the support of his own government was denied him, and yet, in spite of all this, and in spite of treason and cabal and that terrible blow, the treachery of Arnold, he never entertained the thought of abandoning what seemed to be a hopeless cause. Time and again the human tools with which he was obliged to work, broke in his hand, unable to stand the strain of the work to which they were put, and yet he could still be patient with them and could say: "We must bear

up . . . and make the best of mankind as they are since we cannot have them as we wish." When others failed him, he fell back upon his own strength which never failed him, and his own strength rested, in turn, upon a very real faith in the operation and guidance of an "All-wise" Providence. "The All-wise Disposer of events," he said at one time, "has hitherto watched over my steps." Again he said: "The hand of Providence has been so conspicuous in all this that he must be worse than an infidel that lacks faith. . . ."

The stress of war, the hard knocks of enmity and of adverse fortune could not shake his steadfastness, but his resolution had to meet and overcome a still more difficult and subtle foe, which foe he also conquered to his lasting honor. That foe, which caused him no end of torment, was a perfectly natural love of ease. How much he longed for comfort and enjoyment "under his own vine and fig tree," he himself tells us. But he did not yield to this siren for he did not believe that "man was designed by the Creator to live for himself alone." This great thought was the wax with which he stopped up his ears when the siren voice of comfort sang most sweetly. By his firm refusal to indulge himself in ease he proved quite conclusively the splendid steadfastness of his nature and in this, as in many other respects, is a heroic and priceless model to all men. To make comfort the aim of life, as many have done and still do, is spiritually, and often physically, disastrous. "Flowery beds of ease" are not mistakenly considered to be the antithesis to spiritual progress. Nor can a nation long survive unless its citizens are willing not to be too comfortable. The love of comfort not only makes impossible the strenuous life, but it militates against a nation's birth-rate, thus exhausting the capital of the future. The great Roman state fell through love of comfort, for the degenerate, ease-loving Romans of the decline would neither have children, nor would they fight in the national defense. It became necessary, therefore, as everybody knows, for them to hire barbarians to defend them against barbarians, and in the end, these barbarians betrayed their degenerate employers to the enemy.

In refusing to indulge himself in ease Washington may have felt that he was sacrificing the possibility for himself of much happiness, in the interest of the great cause to which he was glad

to give his life. Yet, if he thought this, he was probably mistaken. It is safe to believe that his life was far happier as it was than it would have been could he have lived quietly on his estate in Virginia. Long continued ease is its own worst foe. Is it not remarkable that the world's greatest pessimists, the men who by their own confession have been the most miserable, have, as a general rule, been men who have had all the good things of this world, all, at least, that they needed in order to live a contented life? The philosophic pessimists have usually been of the upper class, as we say, with quite enough wealth to support life. They have not been crushed by the weight of poverty nor yet by the strain of well-nigh insupportable public responsibility. Men who have to endure great burdens of responsibility, who have to face violent hostility, who have to carry through gigantic tasks, are usually optimists. St. Paul was such a man, and these words of his, in which he describes his labors and trials, might be applied to Washington: "In labors more abundant . . . in deaths oft . . . in journeyings often, in perils by mine own countrymen, . . . in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils by the heathen, in perils by false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. . . ." Yet St. Paul was a great optimist, as was Washington also. Both believed in the goodness of God and in the possibility of human salvation and progress.

If our average citizenship is ineffective and weak it is largely because it does not love the heroic in human conduct, and often, indeed, doubts both its existence and possibility. It is because we seek comfort in life, instead of viewing life as an opportunity for high moral achievement, noble living and sublime self-sacrifice. The sheltered and pampered life, we too often forget, is the most miserable of all. The man whose surplus of life energy is never directed to any great social end, whose nervous energy is turned inward; not only loses the thrill of heroic action and the peace that comes to the heart which beats in unison with God's purposes, but actually becomes neurotic, morose, depressed, weak, pessimistic, cynical, irritable and unlovely. However much we may value quick results, to seek to build national greatness upon any makeshift that may appear to obviate the need of steadfastness, patience, endurance, and self-sacrifice, is

to build upon the sand. Without these moral qualities no high achievement is possible. We may well make Washington our model and his steadfastness our example. We do not need to fear least we may over-idealize him. There is nothing to fear from this. We need to fear, rather, the danger of undervaluing him, of reducing him, in our own minds, to our own small dimensions. Unless he stands upon a higher plane than we stand on, he cannot lift us up. We are told that he had a hot temper. This is not necessarily a disqualification for greatness. Certainly we may say of him that his was "an honest and a good heart, which having heard the word—which was the command of God—kept it and brought forth fruit with steadfastness!"

The House of Quiet

By A GUEST

MR. A. C. BENSON has written a book, exquisite in literary finish, called "The House of Quiet." Through it runs a slender thread of first-personal romance. The hero, in early manhood, finds himself handicapped by a physical infirmity which makes a passive part in life his only possible existence. In his narrowed circle, he still finds vital and congenial contact with men and things, while his unfettered soul steepes itself in the loveliness of sky and stream, of straggling hamlet and of brambly road.

It has a lesson. But the House of Quiet of which I propose to write is one of fact, not fiction, and its windows open not only upon the world of men and Nature, but upon the far silent spaces of the infinite realities of God.

One of the Sisterhoods of our Communion takes as its special mission the personal work with souls. This Sisterhood—that of the Holy Nativity—conducts no institutions, in the ordinary sense. But souls must be reached; and a house of rest and Retreats was seen, a few years since, to furnish a line of opportunities other than parochial. As this work has now become more than an experiment, it seems fitting that the Church should hear more about it.

To quote first from the Community's folder: "The House has a two-fold purpose: First: A House where women may make a Retreat of a day or more. . . . From time to time, Retreats will be given by a conductor. Second: A House where women needing a rest of a few days or weeks may find it in the quiet atmosphere of a Religious House.

Opportunity of the first kind is, of course, offered by other Communities in their convents or mission-houses, while that of the second kind is sometimes furnished in guest-houses or quarters. This "House of Quiet," however, is the first one within our Church provided for this two-fold purpose, and open at all seasons.

The work took its inception in a dwelling in West Orange, N. J., generously lent by its owner for the Sisters' indefinite use.

The work soon outgrew the bounds of its first home, and it was found desirable to place a new venture of faith in a locality further from city turmoil, and in a spot which offered especial health advantages of some kind.

It took faith indeed to believe that a commodious house and grounds, in a suitable location, not too far from New York, might, in some way (for there were no funds for purchase), drop at the Sisters' feet. But five years since, the Sisters and Associates kept a Novena for this purpose. Almost immediately following, came the offer, and in due time the gift of a beautiful property at Bay Shore, Long Island, running far down toward the Great South Bay and looking out directly upon Fire Island.

In the front of this tract, amid glorious old trees and spreading lawns, stands the fine old family dwelling so selflessly given away by its inheritor, a member of one of the well known parishes of New York.

One feels that the Churchwomen of this Province of New York and New Jersey, at least, (and I may add especially the readers of the *American Church Monthly*), should make the acquaintance of this House and its work personally, both as an opportunity of upbuilding their own spiritual lives, and as an agency for bringing other souls into closer union with our Blessed Lord, in the sacramental life.

But at least let me take you on a "personally conducted" trip out the South Country Road to the House of the Holy Nativity. (You may have come the forty miles from New York by motor, or you may be just taxi-cabbing—a poor word, but mine own—from the station.) In either case, we now come up the sweep of the drive-way, under the low-branching pines and lindens, to our chosen goal.

From whichever direction you arrive, you will know that you have reached your destination, for a most artistic sign, mid-way of the lot-frontage, will have told you so. You will be sorry not to get more than a glimpse of that lovely Della Robbia under the cross that tops this index of the house; but you will make up your mind that you will see this later, as well as the fine Calvary group and the exquisite statue of the Blessed Mother and Child, each emphasizing, from one or other of the lawns, the holy character of this House of Quiet.

The wide, high pillared porch and the handsome and hospitable door, with its quaint bronze knocker, may for a moment distract your attention, but if you are "quick in the uptake" you will already be deciding that the dwelling is of a quasi-Colonial type belonging to a period when a Mansard roof might be recklessly superimposed upon any structure. At any rate, you find the exterior effect to be of spaciousness, solidity and comfort.

You are introduced at once into the large—I had almost written vast—reception-hall, divided into hall proper and living-room only by graceful Ionic columns. A large fire-place, with Ionic mantel, carries out the classic or Colonial effect, while a lovely (modern) Colonial staircase sweeps gracefully upward, dividing at the high-landing to give right and left vistas of the great hall above.

But it is the dominant crucifix over the fire-place which strikes the key-note of the house and points one naturally to the chapel, which is its heart.

This chapel is a simple room, already too small for the growing needs of the House. Its small altar, whose tabernacle holds always the Divine Presence, is really lovely in its soft Italian walnut coloring. The furnishings and fittings of altar and room, and the few examples of sacred art found here are all one would wish them. Here, the Holy Sacrifice is daily offered, and here the Choir-offices, open to all the guests, are said. And always there is opportunity for private prayer, within the Divine Presence.

One would write with due reticence and simplicity when describing the hospitality accorded by the Sisters. But one may say that one finds here, as in other Religious Houses, that hospitality carried to a fine art. The leisure of the very busy lives is here devoted to the guests without stint, in a generous ministry to spirit, soul and body.

And one would not dwell too much on the material matters of "beds and tables, stools and candle-sticks"—suffice it to say that the house is furnished with rare comfort and beauty, and that the good taste and charm of "old family pieces" are still enjoyed.

Instructions on religious subjects are, of course, very gladly

given by the Sisters whenever desired. Devotional reading is always at the disposal of the guests. Retreats are outlined for such as would spend a Quiet Day, while the opportunity for a conducted Retreat is, as has been noted, furnished as often as possible.

Another purpose of the House, which has already developed, and for which it is hoped it may be more frequently used, is that of conferences for Church workers. At these times, a generous liberty to govern their own arrangements and hours is given the conferees. Indeed, restrictions at any time are as few as may be.

And so it happens that many problems have already been brought for solution here. Many tired minds and bodies have here found rest and solace. This one has come to plan a bit of Church work. This one wants quietly to think out a talk to be given on some Christian Service topic. Some have come merely to rest the body; others, to hold closer communion with God, and to listen for His Voice. None "have come to scoff" certainly, but all "have remained to pray." A number of first confessions have been prepared for in the tiny chapel, and have here been made. Many first Retreats have been entered upon. Often the impulse toward truer knowledge of and technical association with the Religious life has begun here. Sometimes, a Religious vocation has been here revealed.

But the House has, too, a charming side or "atmosphere" not so entirely "serious." Much pleasant companionship with people and with the best of current authors is always possible. Impromptu reading circles gather on the porch, or in the living parlor. The topics of the day are vivaciously discussed. The piano is often opened in the happy evenings. There are jokes and excellent stories told around the great mahogany dining-table and in the recreation quarters that would make a very good volume of *Facetiæ*, could they be collected.

Then there is always "all out of doors" to visit. This pilgrimage must begin with the lovely groups of the Calvary and the Madonna which shed their benediction over the lawns on either side of the house. Often one ends the stroll there, on one of the simple white benches.

Perhaps one may tell here an incident which occurred last

summer, when a mother brought her little daughter, a child of five years, for a long-promised call at the "Retreatment house." The small maiden ran at once to the Calvary group, and looking up into our Blessed Lord's face with tender love, laid one dimpled arm softly about the neck of the Blessed Mother and the other about St. John, as though to offer each the love and consolation of her tender heart. It was a pretty and a touching sight.

In one's garden pilgrimage, one of course goes on to the fruit conservatories, and then to the flower and vegetable gardens, those ministers to the beauty and to the taste (one can hardly avoid the pun) of the House. Then one naturally visits the chickens, the cows and the calf—most admired and petted of creatures. These cows, to be sure, have pedigrees—and even "quarterings"; for are they not respectively two or three quarters of the Channel Island breeds, and the other one or two fractions Holstein? Indeed, we are not sure that the pedigree may not run back to "the cow that jumped over the moon," so frisky is at least one of these beasties.

A further stroll takes one on to the Bay itself, where one rests upon "the yellow sands" and looks out upon Fire Island, and one's thoughts cross bay and sea and shore, and rest with Him who has meted out the bounds of these.

It has occasionally happened that women with strong Protestant convictions have made happy visits to the House of Quiet. No doubt they have come, induced by whatever reason, with some prejudice. Suffice it to say that they seem neither to have taken such away with them, nor to have left its germs to contaminate the house. It has been simply dissipated by the atmosphere of holy brightness and sweetness, which is, after all, but a poor paraphrase for the Love of God.

Thoughts on Medieval Thought

HOWARD R. PATCH, Ph.D.

IN the January issue of the *Yale Review* Hilaire Belloc has a pleasant time setting forth "Thoughts on Modern Thought and a Modern Application of It." An outsider trying to anticipate Belloc's particular slant in this paper would probably guess that here we should find a bitter reactionary attacking the idea of progress. But it is not so. Belloc keeps too close to a discriminating sense of the truth for that; his opponents would say he is too clever to sacrifice that field. Thus he begins by the assertion: "There are two spirits at conflict in our occidental world today. . . . Of these two spirits one is that of continuity and tradition: it is the conservator of our civilization. The other has for its living principle a reaction against our civilization and therefore against tradition and the conservative defense of our culture." Nothing is more distasteful to the world just now than the reactionary; and Belloc reminds us that the modern "radical" is he who most earnestly desires a return to outworn conditions.

There were answers to Mr. Belloc in the following number of the *Review*. John Jay Chapman urged that Belloc dealt only with old-fashioned objections to the Roman Church, and that he failed to mention the deeper and lasting criticisms felt by the world; all of which would be strictly *à propos* if unfortunately the methods in modern thinking which Belloc attacks were not still alive and, indeed, if they did not characterize the other reply to his article, that by Dr. Bissell. For the latter, as a sample of its confusion of thought, we need only to quote the following passage: "It is quite evident that philosophical discussion based on the 'will to believe,' and involving unquestioning acceptance of so-called special 'revelations,' however satisfying to the emotions these may be, can have nothing in common with the principles and methods of science." Belloc is extreme, but he must be right! For ignorance of the development of philosophy,—of what Thomas Aquinas could say in regard to such an issue, for example,—Dr. Bissell's utterance is hard to beat. "Our complaint," says Belloc, "is not of modern physical science—of which we were the creators and in which our work

will always be the most solid (because we are best trained to *think*)—but of ignorance and stupidity in another sphere altogether: in the sphere of philosophy.” Dr. Bissell, however, exhibits a fine specimen of the will to believe in the field of science, whose dogmas, however variable, are none the less dogmatic. But there is no reason why science itself should be in conflict with religion, except for the attitude of the modern scientist. He it is who preserves the old formulæ like “will to believe,” “unquestioning acceptance of so-called special ‘revelations.’” (could any phrase miss the manner of approach more thoroughly than this, or more ludicrously avoid the real point?), and “satisfying to the emotions.” There it is! The old charge of æsthetic conversion! You see, Mr. Chapman, the old ghosts are not laid after all. Intellectual leaders from Thomas Aquinas down to Pasteur and Cardinal Mercier have always been, according to this view, either intellectually unsatisfied or hypocrites. It only takes Dr. Bissell to point out the fallacy, leading to his triumphant pæan, “Cannot his God create evolution as well as man?”

The manner of thought in a different period from ours is studied in a collection of essays under the general title “*Mediaeval Contributions to Modern Civilization*,” edited by F. J. C. Hearnshaw (Henry Holt & Company, 1922.) The method of the book is to set forth the achievements in religion, philosophy, science, art, economics, and so on, during the Middle Ages, in points that seem intelligible and valuable to the modern mind. One weakness in the book is its fear of showing prejudice, on the one hand, and its consequent air of patronage, at times, on the other. Its formula sometimes resembles this: “Though in the Middle Ages they suffered from bad roads, bad plumbing, crimes, cruelty, and filth, they grew lovely flowers in the royal gardens.” Now anybody who knows anything about the Middle Ages, knows that the crimes and filth were in part due to the uncivilized tribes with which the period had to deal at its beginning. And also that during this exceedingly difficult time philosophy and art rose to heights they have since seldom or never reached; and that science, sociology, and economics were given an impetus which has carried them on their way ever since. The book eventually acknowledges most of these facts in one way or another.

It points out, for example, that in the field of philosophy the conception of reality as dependent on time rather than on space is originally Medieval; from that source also comes the progressive conception in the field of science; and in the field of politics the union of politics and religion during the period is upheld as a goal yet to be achieved. One of the most suggestive chapters is that on art, which dwells on the freedom of Medieval art in that it was copying nothing and was bound by few (the book implies no) rules. The studies are all rich with material, a good deal of which is familiar but which has not been popularized. Nowadays when it is a common superstition that life began to be interesting and worth while after the Renaissance, it is good to read such a book as this. Henry Osborn Taylor's attempt to dispense with the term "Renaissance" may some day come to something if we get all the facts regarding what preceded the year 1500, and if our modernists will let us look into the past with free minds and candid souls.

A more consistent study of the Middle Ages, perhaps because it is the work of one man and that of a specialist in the field, is "Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages" by Maurice DeWulf (Princeton University Press, 1922.) If one wants to get a really adequate idea of the spirit of Medievalism, and at the same time discover what scholasticism was about, he can get it here. The book is an interpretation of the Middle Ages through the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas. Politics, art, economics, and sociology during the periods are here studied in relation to the living philosophy of the time. After reading this book one will understand as never before what Henry Adams meant when he talked of the unity of the Middle Ages. If it could be well known generally, the books would be a good corrective to the loose employment of "medieval" in popular speech, as covering everything archaic or contemptible. It is an especially poor piece of slang to be used by those who occupy high places in the Church; for during the Middle Ages the Church undoubtedly accomplished its Christian work more thoroughly than it has ever been able to do since, and it more widely commanded the respect of men and occupied the intellects of the intellectual than it has been able to do today. "Nothing is more false," writes Professor DeWulf, "than the judgment, which

finds credit among so many historians, that one must await the Renaissance to see human personality appraised at its true worth. There are few philosophers who have accentuated the metaphysical, the psychological, the moral, and the social value of the individual so much as did the scholastics."

The book reminds one a little of Grandgent's "Dante" (Duffield & Company, Master Spirits of Literature Series, 1916). In that study Professor Grandgent summarizes the Medieval point of view in relation to the learning and the art of Dante. Among other observations on our present day philosophic fashions, he remarks that current "philosophy *à la mode* would have appeared to St. Thomas like a puppy that runs after every stranger he meets, thinking it may have found its master." There you have a sufficient allegory of the emancipated mind. "Every uncouth thing that shocks the sense, if it but present itself with due solemnity, we are ready to receive as perhaps representative of the science, religion, or art of the future, no matter how ridiculous, how wicked, how hideous it may look. We have thrown our compass overboard, and are now drifting hither and thither as purposeless as the time-servers in Dante's *Infernal Vestibule*." We remember with gusto the flavor of Professor Grandgent's essay on "The Dark Ages" ("Old and New," Harvard University Press, 1920). Such attacks on our own period, however, should not make us gloat, nor, on the other hand, should they make us pessimistic; they should merely make us humble. The fact is simply that we need such warnings and such rebukes to make us take fresh counsel with ourselves. Instead of joining in the general clamor of today that "it's what you do, not what you think, that counts," and of giving ourselves over to the view that "doctrine doesn't matter," we should help the movement for education in the Church, for a thorough philosophical training in what constitutes the basis of truth in the Church, and for a thorough understanding of what the Catholic Church can offer as a corrective to the faults of modernism.

The Church Mission of Help and the Modern Girl*

MARY WILLCOX GLENN

I SHOULD like to bring before you the girls who come to Church Mission of Help, just as they are. Not the so-called typical girl of the present day,—not an abstraction,—but girls as individual as any of us, with attributes as distinctive. Each of the seven whom I shall present to you will be nameless, but will be given, to simplify exposition, a number.

A Church Mission of Help visitor wrote of Girl One, “She feels, of course, very lonely in the city, and possibly a little afraid, too.” Girl One is a member of a large family, the father of which became many years ago an intermittent drunkard and a casual wage-earner. The mother, potentially a home-maker, failed through discouragement to win control of her children so that they had never learned to know in the home what it costs in expenditure of sustained physical, mental and moral energy to make good in life. Church affiliations had led to confirmation, but the fact of being confirmed had protected neither Girl One nor her sister, likewise confirmed, from coming under the influence of evil associates in the suburban locality where they lived, and from drifting with the current on to the alluring city. When Girl One was brought, through the hospital social service worker, to Church Mission of Help she was found not only to be lonely and frightened by what the city seemed to her to be, but to have a latent desire for education so that she was eager to enroll in a night school for study after work hours.

Another Church Mission of Help visitor wrote, on early acquaintance, of Girl Two, who came from the open country, where she was reared, remote from city or suburban life, “Yes, she is ambitious, her work record seems good, but she is on the defensive, reticent.” Seventeen years old, with two years of

* This paper was read at a public meeting in Portland at the time of the General Convention by Mrs. John M. Glenn, President of the National Council of The Church Mission of Help, in the interests of which the meeting was held. It seemed to our Executive Committee to set forth so clearly the kind of work the C. M. H. is doing, the spirit in which it does it, and the need for the Church's contribution to this great and grave problem, that we felt it should receive a more permanent form and wider reading. And so at the request of the Executive Committee it is published in the American Church Monthly.

Gilbert Pember, Vice-President.

high school behind her, *Ivanhoe* recalled as part of the required reading of her school days, *Wells's Outlines of History* dipped into by way of being up to date, the big city visualized as a Mecca, money saved, free to go where she chose; naturally she came to the city of her youthful ambitions. She found a decent boarding place through a newspaper advertisement and then began her effort to secure a job. Proud, shy, she was unwilling to let her landlady know that she had no one to turn to for advice. She sat, therefore, one day, a forlorn figure on a park bench trying to discover within herself a clue to the next step she should take to find a job and if possible fulfil her desire to get more than mere money out of her work. She rose, her mind still blank, to learn that while she sat on the bench her neighbor had robbed her pocket of the \$65.00 which remained of what she had saved from her own earnings for her momentous adventure. Her instinct was to conceal that she was penniless. Her clumsy parrying of the landlady's questions raised doubts as to her integrity. The consequent conclusion was that a man or men were involved in her plight. When the Church Mission of Help was asked to aid her, she was known to be without money but there was no explanation as to why. The home address she gave resulted in the return of the letter of inquiry sent in her behalf, marked by the post office, "No Such Person."

After sympathetic contact with the visitor during a period of time which was marked by Girl Two's asking that she might go with the visitor to a service at the Cathedral, she finally told her story. Her mother was dead, her only sister in service, her father, whose affection was centered in an effort to restore to health an only son, had given up their home and carried the invalid to a health resort. The house address Girl Two had given was that of a service place she had held. She, craving stability and affection, was ashamed to say that there was no place which bore for her the name of home. The rector of the church which she, an alleged Episcopalian, attended had no knowledge of her unprotected situation.

"When I was in New York," writes Girl Three, a young Syrian aged eighteen, "I was so disgusted with the living. Now I live the life." Later she writes in another letter. "Just now it is the sunset. It is 30 after eight, and the girl next me is

writing to her mother, and I am going to write to my darling sister, I am very much glad to tell you that I am not going any more to New York . . . I sit high on the bird cage."

The "darling sister" is the Church Mission of Help visitor, the "bird cage" a porch surrounded by trees on which she sits dreaming of testing the wings of her ambition and of building her future home. The porch which gives her the sense of present security is a part of the boarding school in which she was entered through the co-operation of the Church Mission of Help with women members of a denominational society. Her father before his death held a distinguished position under a Turkish ruler. She, a remnant of his dispersed family, drifted westward and into the vast American metropolis.

Youth's undaunted outlook towards the future and faith in what it may offer are crudely expressed by still another girl, whose early steps had trod devious and hideous by-ways of experience which had ended in commitment to an institution. She, Girl Four, writes Church Mission of Help that she is ready now to turn to her, the visitor, for guidance. "Cause you always believe in talking about the future and not the past and I ever had to hear since I was here is, well what was you before now?" There are other revealing letters one looks through in trying to realize the attitude of the young and of their elders to the grim situations which have brought youth to claim the restorative, sustaining care of the Church Society.

The minister of a denominational church, whose letter head gives along with other data the information that his is "a church with a program" and that, moreover, it is "a church for young people" in answer to a request for his co-operation in winning the parents of Girl Five to give her their moral support,—distracted Girl Five, who went from a small town to the city to give birth to a child,—raises the query, "Must her parents know? Is there any virtue in publicity? Shall her parents be cursed with information? . . . the father is one of the quiet, earnest, devoted souls that bears burdens without complaint, but his heart bleeds quickly . . . the mother is one of the sweetest women I know. They must not suffer for a sin that is in no respect theirs." His evasive, astounding response recalls the picture of another young girl, not a prospective mother, whose

home had failed her and who in defiance walked from its door with the nonchalance of one who laughs at affection's tug on the heart strings. A little later she, pathetic Girl Six, sat in a Church Mission of Help office, with head sunk on her arms weeping in desolation for a home which never in any real sense had been hers.

The home that never has been. No grimmer revelation of the power of evil to perpetuate itself comes than through work in behalf of mothers of the illegitimate who are themselves of illegitimate birth. A particular instance is a young woman of exceptional charm and potential worth who had turned her genuine talents into the dead-end effort to beat her way through life. The clue to her, Girl Seven's, wilful, baffling conduct lay, I appreciated finally, after many months' consideration of her perplexing case, in the shock which came to her as a half grown girl that she, an adopted child, had been taken from an institution, that her mother was "no good," her father a wastrel. I can see her profile with its soft outline, her figure with its yielding curves kneeling between me and another Church Mission of Help worker at a Good Friday service in a Gothic church as the huge congregation says in unison, "Lord have mercy upon us miserable sinners." Not yet is her amen to that petition more than a sensuous satisfaction in the inclusion of the Church's worship in the varied experiences of her hectic life. Intercessions of the society are offered continuously that she may be led to seek forgiveness of her sins, that those who work in her behalf may be guided to touch the mainspring of her contrary behavior and to help her to turn to God for grace to move straight.

What do these detached fragmentary facts about seven girls mean to us? Just this: We can be sure that in practically every section of our country there are restless, undisciplined young people who start on youth's perennial adventure to "lay hold on life" with no hand to steady, foot to lead, head to direct or heart to sympathize; in spite of the way life breaks those who try to grasp its gifts with no knowledge of what is entailed in finding the way. A young teacher in a school for well-to-do girls in a city of the Southwest has given, in answer to my questions, instances of anti-social behavior on the part of her pupils, which

are identical in character with those of girls under care of Church Mission of Help. She writes of an attractive, spirited daughter of parents of means and standing in their community, "Her mother is a careless and restless woman who is engaged in clerical work because she detests house work, consequently my pupil and her brother, a few years older, have attended school only when they pleased, for there was no one at home in the day time. She has been found by the school to be corresponding in a compromising way with a man she met casually."

She writes of another girl, the daughter of "a quiet, gentle father" who died recently of tuberculosis and who had associated his children with him in recreation, that "she is attractive, has lively manners and is popular at school." The mother, however, is vain, carefree. Since her husband's death she has thought only of herself and has allowed her daughter and little son to be on the streets until late hours. The former, now but sixteen, fell under the influence of rough girls and became "desperately afraid" of revealing the experiences which came to her under the guise of fun. Finally she turned in her distress to the recreational director of the school. The director, in her turn, felt keenly the need of some organization that might make individual study of the religious and social needs of this and other like-conditioned girls.

Representative mission workers of our Church in the Appalachian mountains met this past spring immediately preceding the Knoxville Conference for mountain workers, because some of their number had expressed their need of advice as to how to meet the social problems of the young people under their jurisdiction. As I talk with women missionaries from the foreign field, listen to a woman missionary from Ketchikan, talk to a Japanese priest about the plight of young girls in the diocese of Kyoto, correspond with a priest about similar situations in Wyoming, I get the uniform impression of the plight of unprotected, capricious youth.

No survey of local situations is required as preliminary to the defensible assertion that in any given diocese or missionary district there are young people who need not only such spiritual direction as clergy and laymen and women are giving; such opportunities for team activity and mutual protection and

guidance as are offered by the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, the Girl's Friendly Society and other young people's societies of our own and other churches, and by so-called secular agencies; but they need also an instrument of our Church which will draw into being a compact body of consecrated women—and of men, too—who will train to render the specialized service which is required in order to meet the specific and varied necessities of girls such as our seven. To inveigh against broken homes such as the young teacher from the Southwest depicts, to recognize that the vicious triangle twists the moral life of the children of the perverted parents, are not enough. Christians must put hand to the difficult and costly work of picking up fragments of families and with the help of the Church building each again into a stable part of a fundamental institution.

What makes the heart ache in reading our Church Mission of Help records and in thinking of undisciplined youth, whether poor or rich, what makes one yearn to increase indefinitely the force trained to help them meet their difficult problem of self-control, is that the despicable path they tread is walked in such loneliness of spirit, is so bereft of understanding companionship. Breath spent, I repeat, on deriding parents will get us nowhere. Berating individuals for smugly acting as if the girl with a past has a permanent taint, railing against such,—as the pastor of Girl Five, who asserts that the parents are in no sense responsible for the social consequences of the sins of their children,—neither these nor any other theoretical pronouncements will put a life together. Christian action is called for.

It is of the essence of sins of human relationship that the sins of one partner to a relationship are visited upon all those who come within the circle of that relationship. Wrong breeds wrong and only through acts of righteousness can the vicious circle be broken. The vicarious provision of true home life must equal in amount the sum of broken homes from out of which distempered life moves, if there is to be the social salvage of these lives broken by illicit, casual relationships. For that reason the Church can never rest satisfied merely with the provision of Homes with a capital "H". Reformatories and rescue homes form an essential part of the provision required, but only a part. Church Mission of Help works with and urges adequate support

of church institutions. It believes, however, that each girl's requirement is individual. Neither one nor several institutions can meet the varied types of service called for. There must be a corps of church workers trained to study, to develop resources, to stand by each girl in need of rescue, reformation and preventive care until she has been fitted into the niche, which for her may prove to be a port of Christian security, the harbor from which she may launch anew her caked bark of aspiration. The port of Christian security! When I think of what that port can offer and what in horrible contrast it means to be classed with those who are "verily the most miserable of sheep", with those who are of "the flock of slaughter", a picture comes to my mind of a young woman at the victrola in a Church Mission of Help office, watching what impression the music she regulates makes on a small, carefully selected group of girls gathered together for a Christmas party. Later she lifts her baby from the crib in the nearby nursery and brings it into the circle of those other girls who must travel a long way before they reach the plane of self-control, of considered, considerate action, on to which she has laboriously, with many backslidings, climbed. Six years ago no one had fewer convictions of right, no one had more completely thrown conventions overboard, no one gave less time to conjecture as to where her vicious actions would lead. No considered purpose fed the spring of her action. Her impulses submitted to no thwarting. The picture of her helping Church Mission of Help entertain other undisciplined girls, of her caring for her baby, recalls the series of steps taken by patient, devoted workers to help her recover her social status. The gradual break with evil associates; the painstaking and repeated use of clinics and hospitals to replace the ravages of physical abuse; the knowledge gained of her family background; the close contact with the man whom she married after she had had illicit relations with other men; the slow bringing of him, her, and the child (not his) under the steadying influence of an ordered home, a home of their making; the tenacious decision not to let the evil spirit which gripped her at times drag her permanently back into the life from which she had been withdrawn; these are some of the steps. Three incidents in particular are recalled. First, her proud display in the office of some of her fine handiwork which had gone into the making of the baby's

clothes; second, the visit to the office of the seemingly dull, unimaginative husband to ask that steps be taken to have her first child made his by legal adoption before their child was born; third, the day of the new baby's baptism, when some of their Church Mission of Help friends gathered in their home to eat in common the meal which made a festival of the baby's becoming an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Many times the workers concerned with the salvation of that particular man and woman made group consideration serve as the basis for action. The fellowship of service gave "courage, sympathy, proportion, outlook and insight," the attributes of fellowship which Father Bull enumerated in a recent charge to a body of clergy gathered to discuss church fellowship. After deliberate, sustained effort to follow the clues which led to a knowledge of the gross facts of this specific case the workers had faced what it would cost in human energy to take one by one the steps in treatment which the findings indicated to be necessary. They, too, showed courage in helping a weak purpose reassert itself after repeated defeat. Eye to eye they had seen, they and she, what the fight entailed. They had maintained proportion in weighing the various aspects of the whole difficult case. They had held always in mind the goal of their service. They never lost their sense of this intensely individual girl's having a central spark of spiritual energy which under God's guidance might light a steady flame of righteous living. Moreover, though tempted, they did not allow themselves to think of her as a problem. They did not weaken their sense of personal responsibility by discussing, in relation to her need, society's responsibility for her conduct. They knew that she was a social product. Lessons learned in meeting her claims on Christian service must be utilized in a constructive effort to help lessen the anti-social strain borne by other like-tempered young people. Their immediate task was, however, to release her personality. Personality, hers as well as any one else's, could be developed only as it was recognized to be existent in and through relationship with other forces: divine, human, social. She was what she had seemed to be through betrayal of her personality, through casual association with evil persons and agencies. Her real personality must emerge through entering into relationship with honest, God-fearing men and women who lived in stable homes. The law of

her nature demanded that she must win what she was to hold, for as Dr. DuBose once put it, anything that is done "merely upon us displaces and annuls the personality."

The group in dismay watched at times the terrifying outcroppings of her uncontrollable, unsocial impulse to throw off restraints on conduct. They needed to pray ever anew for insight, so that they who had been protected against fierce onslaughts on their personality might not lose their consciousness of the quality, the essence that was she, herself. They, too, had to resist becoming such as Prof. Jacks has described, a description that Christian workers should ever recall:

"Their minds were like old gardens that had been digged and dunged for eight hundred years; they were full of flowers, fruit and vegetables—all of the best, with many a trim lawn and vine-hung pergola, but with no wild roses and scarcely any weeds. To turn the desert into a garden of the Lord like unto their own, was their high ambition and their appointed task. Few of them paused to reflect how wild the garden was in which the Lord was once seen walking in the cool of the day."

Church Mission of Help is never permitted by the exigencies of its intake to forget that a considerable proportion of girls coming under its care will inevitably be mentally lacking. The Church in its endeavor to develop right ethical concepts in the community must have a definite part in any general social effort made to lessen incompetence and tragedy resulting from feeble-mindedness. But Christian protection must be given, while the results of collective, remedial and preventive care are pending, to those who peculiarly bear the brunt of the social sins of receding generations. No section of our country is so fortunate as to have within its boundaries none such. Their moral security lies, as it were, in trust in the hands of the community. They will maintain their innocence if society is Christian enough to permit them to do so.

Not only the feeble-minded but all youth whose armour of defense is unbuckled make inarticulate appeal to be understood. God be praised for an era when youth is quick to adventure because of its joy in the effort to lay hold on life. God be praised for youth's intrepidity. God give us grace, us elders, to realize our belief that social life can be redeemed only by prayer

as the medium through which we may learn how to take our share in turning the present turbulent flow of youthful energy into channels of new, vigorous life.

Church Mission of Help made a factor in this task of the post-war decade, through organization diocese by diocese, can help avert the tragedy of previous kaleidoscopic epochs, when youth's release from the conventional, the shucking of the husks, has exposed the tender seeds of reverence to decay.

Book Reviews

Catholicism and Criticism. By Père Etienne Hugueny, O.P. Translated from the fourth French edition by Father Stanislaus M. Hogan, O.P. New York: Longmans, 1922; pp. 318. \$3.50.

The purpose of this book is so admirable that we can only regret that the treatment is not more adequate. The first six chapters present a criticism of certain Modernistic conclusions, mainly those of Loisy in his *Evangelies Synoptiques*, and of Professor Guignebert's *Modernism et Tradition Catholique en France*. After this comes a rapid survey of non-Roman Communions, with three interesting appendices on the date of Acts, the martyrs of Lyons in 177, and the miracle at Favernay in 1608.

The weakness of this treatise, however, lies in its adoption of what we conceive to be a fundamentally wrong method of apologetics. The author strives to vanquish the Modernist by clever argument as to the details in the latter's conclusions, rather than by any consideration of general principles. Hence one feels that to all his contentions there is still much more to be said, while his marshalling of detail is impressive only when certain general principles are first conceded. One example will illustrate the lack of finality in this method.

The author devotes one whole chapter to the Eucharistic miracle of the suspended monstrance at Faveray on Whitsun Monday in the year 1608. After a fire in which most of the sanctuary was gutted, the monstrance with two consecrated Hosts was discovered suspended several feet in the air without visible support. Two days of devotion were spent by the villagers before this wonder, and then the monstrance slid quietly down upon a corporal especially prepared for it. Now to the mind attuned to Catholic principles, there is nothing impossible in this. Granted (1) the fact of our Lord's Presence, and (2) devotion of the faithful sufficient to create an interplay of the material and spiritual worlds, such a portent as above narrated is entirely congruous. But it is just these "grantedes" which the unbeliever does *not* accept, and it is these principles which must be considered *before* rather than after any discussion of the portent itself, if the investigation is to be of profit to the Faith. In sharpest contrast to the treatment here employed, we would cite as an example of the right kind of apologetics, the recent volume of *Essays on the Philosophy of Religion* by Baron von Hügel. These *Essays* cover practically the same ground as does this volume of

Hugueny, but their argument lies in the deepest and most firmly grounded principles of human thought. There can really be no question as to which volume will make the more converts.

Nevertheless, there is some undoubtedly brilliant writing in this book, and its appearance is at least a token of the mental agility of French Dominicanism.

CECIL ROBERTS.

Historic Theories of Atonement, with Comments. Robert Mackintosh, D.D. New York: Doran (Hodder and Stoughton), 1920; pp. x+319. \$1.50.

The author, an English Congregationalist, has lectured and written for some years past on the doctrine of the Atonement, and certain parts of this volume have previously appeared as separate articles in issues of the *Expositor*. As the title suggests, the body of the work is a critique of the various theories concerning our Lord's atonement which have found expression from patristic times down to the present day. We have had several summaries of like nature in recent years, and an important feature of the book now before us is the author's review of the work of his predecessors in this field. To introduce his discussion of the theories, he deals in turn with the moral necessity of atonement, the Old Testament preparation for the doctrine, Christ's thought of His own death, and the apostolic teaching of atonement. Then after his main task is completed he essays a tentative construction of the doctrine as the fruit of his study. Having endeavored to show that the more ambitious historic theories have all been comparative failures, and expressly disclaiming the ability or the desire to elaborate any new theory to supersede or to supplement them, he yet feels that an effort should be made to mark out distinct lines of approach to an understanding of the mystery which shall avoid the defects of both "objective" and "moral influence" theories. His positive contribution to this is given in a few suggestions based on the central thought of fundamental moral necessity, thus repeating the point stressed in the introductory chapter. Three specifications follow:—(a) the moral necessity of the redemption of human character, (b) that of the glory of God (considered not in disjunction from (a) but in opposition to it) and (c) that of the moral nature of things, the "law" and "love" of God, which are prior to—and in part embodied in—man's constitution.

The writer possesses real erudition and other qualifications for a

critical work of this sort—not the least of these a profound faith in our Lord as the one and only Saviour of mankind. His discussion is always on a high plane, exhibiting painstaking effort to represent fairly even those positions from which he most strongly dissents, and to emphasize what elements of truth they embody. Where divergent views indicate radical differences, or where they are based on identical premises, the fact is pointed out; so that the various types of theory are noted as particular theories illustrate them without the attempt at formal classification. He is also the possessor of a delightful style and an original way of putting things which grips the attention and stimulates the interest of the reader. Even when he is dealing with matters most profound, he can pause for a simple question, sometimes couched in colloquial terms, which makes one feel like a party to his conversation rather than a mere auditor. That he has the good sense not to despise such adventitious aids to the expression of his thought is one of the great merits of the book. It certainly does not detract from its substantial value to the serious student for whom, as a matter of course, he writes.

It remains to be said, however, that while we are always interested we are not always convinced. The limitations of the author's doctrinal positions are from the Churchman's point of view very serious limitations in any discussion of this theme. They show themselves again and again in casual remarks, mere *obiter dicta*, and occasionally in dogmatic tone by striking statements which jar upon our sensibilities. Perhaps to quote one such passage that we have in mind will best convey our meaning. We note it because it seems pivotal. He is criticising Moberly for some of the latter's animadversions on McCleod Campbell "in the interest of sacramentalism", and remarks: "But we must remember that Moberly is a High Churchman. For him, sacraments are the most spiritual of all spiritual things." Note here the implication of the *sacramentarian* as distinguished from the *sacramentalist* position, to wit, that sacraments are only material outward signs, with which we might compare the author's characterization of the scholastic doctrine of transubstantiation as "childish and materialistic"—the very opposite of the fact. But, to resume, he goes on to say: "It is necessary to speak frankly on this matter. Especially is frankness called for at the present moment, when the Free and Protestant Churches are being rushed toward ill-conceived schemes of corporate ecclesiastical union—schemes which could accrue for good to no party except the sacramentalists. We who are Protestant evangelicals must stand for the truth of the

Gospel, giving place by way of subjection for not so much as an hour. And the truth is this, that sacraments can play no distinctive part whether in theology or in the Christian salvation." Evidently the movement calling itself "Free Catholicism" is something to be feared. It is characteristic of the author's disposition to be fair (which we have noted above) that three or four sentences down the page he adds: "It is possible that Protestantism has unduly depreciated sacraments. The Lord's Supper would appear to be the original sacred germ or cell—or the apostolate *plus* the Lord's Supper—out of which the whole Christian Church as an institution was evolved. Within the life of that institution the Eucharist proves itself a vehicle of fellowship between Christian and Christian, and much more between the Christian and Christ. It is God's wonderful gift to His people. But essential to salvation? Never, and nevermore! We dare not allow Moberly's peculiar blend of Atonement—theology with sacramental theology—to rob us of what our fathers termed 'the finished work of Christ'". One might pause to comment on the very obvious significance of some of the truths conceded by the writer in this passage if it were worth while; or we might be satisfied to remark simply that his conception of the "finished work" of our Lord is not more fatal to sacramental theology than to the heavenly intercession of Christ, which he admits is New Testament doctrine. But, for our present purpose, it is more important to point out the bearing of the developed sacramental teaching of the Church upon the author's constructive suggestions in the last chapter of the book.

As already noted, these are based upon fundamental moral necessities. We can have no quarrel with this primary assumption. Aside from "the redemption of human character" the atonement is utterly meaningless. With or without atonement, it must be forever true that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." The general proposition that the Church and the Christian sacraments are "the extension of the Incarnation" and that their justification as a matter of theory is their purpose to apply to individual human beings the benefits of the Passion—this commonplace of Catholic teaching, instead of being regarded as mere surplusage detracting from the Christian doctrine of reconciliation should be recognized as being in all respects in essential harmony with it. Deny the sacramental principle in the supposed interest of what is termed "the simple Gospel", and at once all sorts of gratuitous difficulties emerge, not only with reference to the doctrine of the Church and the sacraments but also in connection with the doctrines concerning the

Person and the work of our Lord. The doctrine of the atonement suffers serious impairment when it is isolated from its context, and when even devout thinkers attempt the task the net result must always be "comparative failure".

T. B. F.

The Boyhood Consciousness of Christ. By the Rev. P. J. Temple. New York: Macmillan's, 1922; pp. xi+244. \$3.50.

This monograph, "a critical examination of Luke ii, 49" by a Roman Catholic scholar, promises more than it fulfills. There is a great deal of erudition, of the encyclopaedic sort, but little critical discrimination; much learning, based on the use of concordances, *catenae*, and indices, yet not a great amount of evidence-weighing, balanced judgment of sources, or free investigation. The "historical criticism" which the writer professes ought surely to be altered to read, "apologetical defence." As a piece of apologetic it is not without value, and some use of the evidence collected with painful care by the author might be made by those who would like it all assembled in a convenient volume. The real question at issue is never fairly grappled with,—the problem as to the growth in divine consciousness of the incarnate Son of God. The question is never even really raised, for Roman theology has treated it as closed. Such conclusions as the book makes are not *termini ad quos*, but *principia a quibus*.

The avid caution of the writer is never more manifest than in his translation of the text of St. Luke ii, 49. "Why did you seek me? Did you not know that in the (things) of My Father I must be?" may be a so-called *literal* translation, with perhaps one exception: the Greek original makes sense, but the English translation does not. Just why the author fails to avail himself of the conclusive evidence of the meaning of "in the of my Father," as demonstrated by the Papyri (cf. P. Oxy. 523,—conveniently accessible in Milligan, *Greek Papyri*, p. 97) and evinced in the very texts of the Fathers he quotes, is not clear. The phrase certainly means the same as the French *chez*.

His conclusion may be given in his own words,—developed after a most painstaking and thorough presentation of a vast amount of "evidence" which could all have been better given in summary: "According to Luke ii, 49, Christ at the age of twelve was fully aware of His real Divine Sonship. His expression of this fact is made with such calmness and indeed emphasis that there is left no ground or basis for any view that His self-consciousness was then awakening. Jesus was fully

self-conscious then, and there are no signs or hints in His saying or in any text of the Scripture of any dawning consciousness or of any time when His self-consciousness was wanting to Him. The inspired records thus imply, what is handed down in tradition, that there never was a moment when Christ did not actually know exactly the nature of His filial relation to God " (p. 196). " The mere fact that contrary to all ordinary laws of development and exclusive of every natural explanation Christ at a tender age should declare His real Divine Sonship, is in itself a strong argument for his Divinity " (p. 197). F. GAVIN.

On the Roll of Honour. Some Saintly Lives of Modern Times. By Isa. J. Postgate. London: The Faith Press, 1922; pp. vii+115; 2/6.

Very readable and very inspiring are these brief accounts. The saints acclaimed are John Keble, Dr. Pusey, Canon Carter, Dean Church, Dr. Neale, Bishop King of Lincoln, Dr. Liddon, the Pollock brothers, Dean Butler, Bishop Wilkinson, Fr. Stanton, Canon Brooke, Bishop Collins of Gibraltar and Bishop Field of Newfoundland. Truly there were giants in those days!

The author mentions among various interesting facts that Dr. Pusey at the age of sixty said Mass daily, generally at 4 A.M., and that Keble said the Prayer Book litany at 5:30 A.M. twice a week for four years during a period of stress.

A Roman Catholic claiming that the English Church could not produce saints said to a member of that Church in one of the Roman Basilicas: " Look at that priest who is now passing us, one can see by his face that he is a saint. You cannot show me such men in your Church." The passing priest was Canon Carter of Clewer.

Dean Church tells how when he was an undergraduate he was warned that Keble's " Christian Year " was not exactly sound about vital religion!

Dr. Neale on his thirteenth birthday received as presents Wilson's " Evidences of Christianity," Watts on " The Improvement of the Mind," Leighton's " Holy Life " and " Jewish Records." Perhaps we need not wonder that as a man he knew twenty languages. While Warden of Sackville College he was rebuked by his Bishop for introducing " frippery " and " spiritual haberdashery." He " revenged himself " only by dedicating some of his poems to this same ordinary.

Bishop King when appointed to the See of Lincoln said: " I shall try

to be the bishop of the poor. If I can feel that I think that I shall be happy."

He once wrote: "I am sure that the best evidence that we can give for the Church is a Christlike clergy and a Christlike people."

Dr. Liddon wrote sermons at the age of sixteen. Every day of his life after he had received the Sacrament of Confirmation he used the "Veni Creator Spiritus." The Pollock brothers of St. Alban's, Birmingham, laid great emphasis on Christian education. They "often declared that they would give up their church rather than their school."

"The dear Saviour." Those who heard Fr. Stanton utter those three words will never forget how his face lighted up, and the tone of deep, adoring affection in which they were pronounced." An old-fashioned Baptist minister when in London used to go to St. Alban's, Holborn, "because he knew that he should hear the Gospel there."

Little Spanish children used to want to kiss Bishop Collins' pectoral cross. Once when he was coming out of a cathedral in Spain people gathered around him to kiss his hand: "but I am the English Catholicus," he said in their own language and they replied "we know who you are."

Surely such genuine Catholic piety and intellectual brilliancy as are represented in these lives the Anglican Communion may be always proud of.

G. P. C.

Paul, Hero and Saint. By Leo Gregory Fink. N. Y.: Paulist Press, 1921; pp. 227, cloth.

In *Paul, Hero and Saint*, we have the type of book that every child and every adult will thoroughly enjoy, if he would not be too greatly distressed by a slight degree of Roman propaganda. The writer has taken advantage of one of the greatest human tendencies—hero worship—in delivering a truly religious message. What person, be he child or man, does not love a tale of action and daring? Who does not love to trace the steps of heroism through untold perils and difficulties in loyalty to country or to a great cause? In relying on hero-worship the author has found a sure means of holding the attention of his readers and of imprinting his story upon their minds, and how readily the Christian faith lends itself to this treatment! We venture to boast that no other faith is so full of noble and inspired examples of pure courage of conviction and heroism.

The most difficult problem of the Church today is that of getting

and holding the interest of the adolescent boy—the boy who has reached the age when, though he is not ashamed of his belief, he is afraid to be frank with himself and with others about it. In just such a contingency as this a work like the one in question is of untold value. Though shy of pure religion as such, these boys are abnormally possessed with this spirit of hero-worship. They aspire to greatness and admire it in others. Certainly the great Christian Saints are men after their own hearts.

Paul, Hero and Saint, is the simple story of the life of a great man simply told. The facts of the life of Paul as we know them from the Bible are exactly followed, and where the Bible and tradition fail to give us any information, the author has constructed events in keeping with the nature and character of his subject. The work is virile and thrilling and would be a worthy and ideal basis for the Church School study of older boys and young men.

W. MACD.

De Civitate Dei, “*The Political Aspects of St. Augustine’s ‘City of God.’*” By John Neville Figgis, Litt. D., late of the Community of the Resurrection. London: Longmans, 1921; pp. 132 (Cloth).

The last piece of work Father Figgis was able to do was the delivery of the Stewart Pringle Lectures at Oxford in 1918. They are now presented to the public in book form. St. Augustine’s *De Civitate* has been a topic for discussion and interpretation throughout the middle ages, and one would be led to suppose that the subject would have been worn threadbare by the twentieth century. Father Figgis has, however, struck a new note and has entered upon untrodden ways.

In his first chapter he treats of the general scope of the work. He shows something of the nature of the great patriarch of the fifth century and, in the light of this, how and why the *De Civitate* was written. It must be remembered that Rome, the Eternal City, was sacked by the barbarians in 410 A. D. This was a world calamity and the enemies of Christianity were quick to see their advantage. Had the Romans, they argued, remained true to their ancient pagan gods this disaster would never have befallen them. The reason for the downfall was the desertion of the pagan gods for the faith of Christ. It was to combat this view that St. Augustine took up his cudgels. It was his purpose to show that Rome was not the Eternal City and that its fall was but an incident leading to true felicity in the “City of God.”

This beginning leads Father Figgis to a discussion of St. Augustine’s

philosophy of history. "Time and the world are coeval," he says, and "God Himself is the best poet." Again, the author points out that St. Augustine was a great aesthete and his worship of beauty is made manifest in his doctrine of history. "It is, in truth, a heavenly song—that in some way or other, the evil in the world is overruled by the good and beauty of the whole—just as discords are resolved by a skillful composer." Or, as St. Augustine himself sums up the matter, "God is the unchangeable Governor as He is the unchangeable Creator of all mutable things, ordering all events in His Providence until the beauty of the completed course of time, the component parts of which are the dispensations adapted to each successive age, shall be finished, like the grand melody of some ineffably rare master of song."

The next chapter treats of St. Augustine's attitude toward the State. "He did not," says Father Figgis, "set out to propound a theory of state. There is no discussion on the merits of various forms of government though there is the classic passage known as the 'Mirror of Princes' describing the attributes of a good king." St. Augustine neither despised nor renounced the goods of human life. His attitude was simply that of wishing to elevate them to the highest possible plane. As to what form of government is best fitted to accomplish this end, St. Augustine gives us no information.

In St. Augustine's discussion as to the place of the Church in the State, we are warned again that a "caveat" must be entered. The position assigned to the Church, namely, that of the agent of the Kingdom of God on the earth, did not necessarily apply to the ecclesiastical body as then constituted. The argument was really in defense of the right to persecute. The State had the right to punish offenders to make them conform to its rules, and the Church as the "higher state" should have a like right. The Church should have the same power as the State. Such a trend of thought leads to the theocratic state, though St. Augustine lets the matter rest there.

The remaining two chapters are devoted to an outline of the influence of the "De Civitate" on the mediaeval and later ages. The struggles between Church and State and the rise of the idea of the Holy Roman Empire are traced to this source. And later, the famous doctrines of Moore's *Utopia* and the great aspirations of Savonarola for his native city, Florence, are shown to have had their root in the philosophy of "The City of God."

The book is fascinating to a degree. The subject is treated in an orderly and a scholarly manner. The entire idea, despite the antiquity of the subject, still possesses enough of the vital and novel to well deserve the consideration of the modern Churchman and scholar. W. MACD.

Work, Wealth and Wages. By Rev. J. Husslein, Ph.D., S.J. Chicago: Matre and Company; pp. 159, cloth.

Father Husslein's latest book, *Work, Wealth and Wages* purports to be an outline of the Catholic labor policy and to carry with it a plan for the betterment of the industrial disorders of the present era. He adopts as the working principle or basic panacea wherewith to effect this cure the theory of the living wage, and with this he proceeds to develop and to explain the true purpose of labor, of labor organization and of capitalism. The living wage is that wage which provides amply for a man and a family—allowing the mother to remain at home with her children and to permit the entire family to enjoy a comfortable though a frugal home life.

Father Husslein has touched the heart of the matter in a sense, but we do not feel that he has been sufficiently explicit. He is quite justified in his praise of the mediaeval Guilds and in his assertion that these organizations were possessed of the true spirit of industrial organization, be it of labor or of capital. The ancient Guilds stood for justice to the worker, to the employer and to the consumer. They saw to it that the worker received a just remuneration for his labor and that his working conditions were humane; they saw to it that the employer received his due return on the capital invested; but on the other hand, they saw to it that the laborer did his work thoroughly and wholeheartedly. The laborer, employer and consumer were all equally protected. In short, the idea behind the entire system was the idea of unselfishness and justice—public service. It is this idea that we feel to be really in the back of Father Husslein's mind though he is not quite as explicit as we could wish in saying so.

This spirit is the real remedy for our social ills, but it can be brought about only through the slow process of education. The ancient saying that "all men are created equal" interpreted as the Socialists interpret it is fallacious in the extreme. As Father Husslein points out, Pope Pius X in his "Catholic Social Action" admirably defines this term "equality" when he says: "The equality of the different members of

society consists solely in this: that they all come from the hand of their creator, that they have been redeemed by Jesus Christ, and that they will be judged and rewarded or punished by God according to the exact measure of their merits and of their demerits." As for the right of all men to equal wealth and share in this world's goods there is no justification for the theory. A man's right to this world's goods is measured solely by his industry, his thrift, and his contribution to society. When we can inculcate through the channels of education a sense of the responsibility of the individual man, be he great or small, for the general welfare of the society to which he belongs the social problem will be solved. Such is Father Husslein's view. Every mortal man who breathes the breath of heaven and demands the fruits of society should feel that he must work to produce something for the general good of that society. Fair wage, fair profit and fair industry without the bugbear of individual avarice is what Father Husslein recommends as the panacea for industrial evil. The challenge is thrown at the feet of the Church and of our schools.

W. MACD.

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Being of God. By Vernon F. Storr, M.A. New York and London: Longmans, 1922; pp. 74. \$60.

Jesus of Nazareth. By Geo. H. Barton, Ph.D., LL.D. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. xiii+395. \$2.00.

The Christian Call and Motive. By Various Writers. London: S. P. C. K., New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. viii+181+8. 5/—.

The Albigensian Heresy. By Rev. H. J. Warner, M.A. London: S. P. C. K., and New York, Macmillan, 1922; pp. 94.

Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians. By Prof. James Riggs and Prof. H. L. Reed. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. 314. \$1.60.

The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin. By E. J. Bicknell, M.A. New York: Longmans, 1922; pp. x+129. \$2.00.

The Religion of the Primitives. Monsignor A. Le Roy. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. 10+334. \$2.50.

Preaching Missions—The Why and How. By a Commission. New York: Church Missions House, 1922; pp. 81.

Church Hymns and Services. Published by the Church Pension Fund. Fort Wayne: Parish Press, 1921; pp. 674.

The Thoughts of Youth. By Samuel S. Drury. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. 186. \$1.50.

Human Character. By Hugh Eliot. New York: Longmans, 1922, pp. xvi+272. \$2.50.

Man and the Two Worlds. By William Frederick Dix and Randall Salisbury. New York: Harper's, 1922; pp. xiii+177. \$1.50.

The Influence of the Church on Modern Problems. By Various Writers. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. ix+223. \$1.50.

Belief in Christ. By Charles Gore, D.D., formerly Bishop of Oxford. New York: Scribner's, 1922; pp. x+329. \$2.25.

Self Healing Simplified. By George Landor Perin. New York: Doran, 1922; pp. xiv+230. \$1.50.

The Christian Hypothesis. By E. C. Tainsh. New York: Longmans, 1922; pp. 105. \$1.25.

The Art of Preaching. By Chas. R. Brown. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. ix+250.

On What Authority? By Rt. Rev. Edmund Arbuthnott Knox, DD., late Bishop of Manchester. New York and London: Longmans, Green, 1922; pp. xi+284. \$2.50.

A Grammar of Belief. By Charles Lemuel Dibble. London: Mowbray and Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1922; pp. x+208. \$1.50.

In His Will. By the Bishop of Zanzibar. London, S. P. C. K. and New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. 183.

Men of the Way. By Louis Tucker. London, Mowbray, and Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1922; pp. viii+247. \$2.50.

NEW EDITIONS:

Catholic Principles. By Rev. Frank N. Westcott.

Reasons for Being a Churchman. By Arthur W. Little, S.T.D., L.H.D.

The Faith by Which We Live. By Bishop Fiske. Milwaukee: Morehouse & Co. Paper cover. 50c.

PAMPHLETS:

The Lord's Plan for the Service of the Lord's Day (Tract of the Eucharistic League).

The Trend of Thought in Contemporary Philosophy. New York: Longmans, 1922; pp. 30. \$40.